



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2005

No. 151

House of Representatives

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GOHMERT).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
November 15, 2005.

I hereby appoint the Honorable LOUIE GOHMERT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

PRESIDENT BUSH CAN'T REWRITE HISTORY

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, beginning on Veterans Day, President Bush has begun a series of attacks against his critics on the war in Iraq. He has been supported by a well-orchestrated set of groupies of conservative policymakers, Members of Congress and talking heads all spouting the same line, that the Bush Administration was not alone in believing that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction. Everyone thought so. And the administration

certainly did not manipulate or misrepresent any intelligence to Congress, the American people or to the international community.

Mr. Speaker, this is just one more false claim in a history of falsehoods put forward by this administration in its effort to cover up its failures in Iraq. Today's New York Times editorial attempts to set the record straight on the Bush coverup of the truth.

On Veterans Day, President Bush claimed that Congress had access to the same intelligence as his administration. This is patently false. According to the Washington Post and The New York Times, President Bush and his aides had access to much more voluminous intelligence information than did lawmakers, who are dependent on his administration to provide Congress with materials.

More recently, the President has asserted that Congress had more intelligence information than the White House. This is so patently absurd, I barely know how to respond. The only intelligence materials the Congress has, it receives from the President and his administration.

The President has gone on to state that the bipartisan investigation carried out by the Senate Intelligence Committee found, and I again quote, no evidence of political pressure to change the intelligence community's judgments related to Iraq's weapons programs.

This claim is wrong on several counts. First, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence has not yet done its inquiry into whether Bush officials mischaracterized or misrepresented intelligence.

Second, the Senate Intelligence Committee's first report did find that the national intelligence estimate was manipulated.

Finally, the overall soft approach of this first report by the Senate Intel-

ligence Committee has been disputed by several senior intelligence officials. Richard Kerr, the former acting CIA director, who led an internal investigation of the CIA's failure to correctly analyze Iraq's weapons of mass destruction capability, stated that the intelligence analysts were pressured and heavily so. Senators ROCKEFELLER, DURBIN and LEVIN noted in their additional views to the Senate Intelligence Committee's report that the CIA's independent review found, and I quote, significant pressure on the intelligence community to find evidence that supported a connection between Iraq and al Qaeda.

A second independent investigation by the CIA ombudsman found that the, quote, hammering by the Bush Administration on Iraq intelligence was unusual and that George Tenet confirmed that agency officials had raised with him personally the matter of pressure on analysts.

President Bush tries to assert that President Clinton believed in the same threat. What he leaves out is that President Clinton has repeatedly asserted that he believes it was a mistake to invade Iraq before the United Nations weapons inspectors had a chance to complete their investigation. In fact, the U.N. investigation was aborted before it even had a chance to really begin by the launch of U.S. military operations.

Mr. Speaker, President Bush asserts that other governments' intelligence agencies agreed with ours. That is simply false. Many countries felt that the U.S. intelligence was faulty or overblown and did not agree with their own intelligence data, and that is why they opposed us in the United Nations Security Council or declined to provide troops for our invasion. Even this year we have heard Vice President CHENEY continue to imply that Iraq was somehow tied to the September 11 attacks and was developing weapons of mass destruction.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H10163

Well, let us set the record straight. There were no weapons of mass destruction, there were no ties to al Qaeda, there was no imminent threat. The arguments in favor of war presented to Congress and the American people by the President deliberately used the most inflammatory of language.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say one more word on the President's latest series of attacks. He says that those of us who criticize the war, who called for withdrawal, or who focused on how the American people were deliberately misled into supporting the invasion on Iraq, that somehow we are betraying our troops and advocating a cut-and-run strategy.

Mr. Speaker, our troops, who have carried out this mission with courage, dignity and sacrifice, represent our Nation with honor, but they have been betrayed. They have been betrayed by policymakers who rushed into a war on false pretenses, they were betrayed by policymakers who sent them into harm's way and overruled the good advice of our top military leaders as to troop strength and post-invasion planning, and they have been betrayed by policymakers who will not admit that mistakes were made and significant changes in policy are required in order to bring them home safe and sound.

Critics of this policy strongly support reconstruction assistance for Iraq. We strongly support the training and equipping of Iraqi security forces. We strongly support internationally supported security forces in Iraq. We do not support cutting and running, but we do not support lying and hiding. Mr. Bush cannot rewrite history, he cannot rewrite the intelligence again, and he cannot continue to lie to the American people. The truth, the ugly truth, is coming out.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 2005]

DECODING MR. BUSH'S DENIALS

To avoid having to account for his administration's misleading statements before the war with Iraq, President Bush has tried denial, saying he did not skew the intelligence. He's tried to share the blame, claiming that Congress had the same intelligence he had, as well as President Bill Clinton. He's tried to pass the buck and blame the C.I.A. Lately, he's gone on the attack, accusing Democrats in Congress of aiding the terrorists.

Yesterday in Alaska, Mr. Bush trotted out the same tedious deflection on Iraq that he usually attempts when his back is against the wall: he claims that questioning his actions three years ago is a betrayal of the troops in battle today.

It all amounts to one energetic effort at avoidance. But like the W.M.D. reports that started the whole thing, the only problem is that none of it has been true.

Mr. Bush says everyone had the same intelligence he had—Mr. Clinton and his advisers, foreign governments, and members of Congress—and that all of them reached the same conclusions. The only part that is true is that Mr. Bush was working off the same intelligence Mr. Clinton had. But that is scary, not reassuring. The reports about Saddam Hussein's weapons were old, some more than 10 years old. Nothing was fresher than about five years, except reports that later proved to be fanciful.

Foreign intelligence services did not have full access to American intelligence. But some had dissenting opinions that were ignored or not shown to top American officials. Congress had nothing close to the President's access to intelligence. The National Intelligence Estimate presented to Congress a few days before the vote on war was sanitized to remove dissent and make conjecture seem like fact.

It's hard to imagine what Mr. Bush means when he says everyone reached the same conclusion. There was indeed a widespread belief that Iraq had chemical and biological weapons. But Mr. Clinton looked at the data and concluded that inspections and pressure were working—a view we now know was accurate. France, Russia and Germany said war was not justified. Even Britain admitted later that there had been no new evidence about Iraq, just new politics.

The administration had little company in saying that Iraq was actively trying to build a nuclear weapon. The evidence for this claim was a dubious report about an attempt in 1999 to buy uranium from Niger, later shown to be false, and the infamous aluminum tubes story. That was dismissed at the time by analysts with real expertise.

The Bush administration was also alone in making the absurd claim that Iraq was in league with Al Qaeda and somehow connected to the 9/11 terrorist attacks. That was based on two false tales. One was the supposed trip to Prague by Mohamed Atta, a report that was disputed before the war and came from an unreliable drunk. The other was that Iraq trained Qaeda members in the use of chemical and biological weapons. Before the war, the Defense Intelligence Agency concluded that this was a deliberate fabrication by an informer.

Mr. Bush has said in recent days that the first phase of the Senate Intelligence Committee's investigation on Iraq found no evidence of political pressure to change the intelligence. That is true only in the very narrow way the Republicans on the committee insisted on defining pressure: as direct pressure from senior officials to change intelligence. Instead, the Bush administration made what it wanted to hear crystal clear and kept sending reports back to be redone until it got those answers.

Richard Kerr, a former deputy director of central intelligence, said in 2003 that there was "significant pressure on the intelligence community to find evidence that supported a connection" between Iraq and Al Qaeda. The C.I.A. ombudsman told the Senate Intelligence Committee that the administration's "hammering" on Iraq intelligence was harder than he had seen in his 32 years at the agency.

Mr. Bush and other administration officials say they faithfully reported what they had read. But Vice President Dick Cheney presented the Prague meeting as a fact when even the most supportive analysts considered it highly dubious. The administration has still not acknowledged that tales of Iraq coaching Al Qaeda on chemical warfare were considered false, even at the time they were circulated.

The president and his top advisers may very well have sincerely believed that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction. But they did not allow the American people, or even Congress, to have the information necessary to make reasoned judgments of their own. It's obvious that the Bush administration misled Americans about Mr. Hussein's weapons and his terrorist connections. We need to know how that happened and why.

Mr. Bush said last Friday that he welcomed debate, even in a time of war, but that "it is deeply irresponsible to rewrite the history of how that war began." We agree,

but it is Mr. Bush and his team who are rewriting history.

NEW DAY FOR HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, contrary to what some of my friends on the other side of the aisle do, I like to take this time, morning hour, and share a little good news with the American people, because this is an exciting day. It is a new day for health care in our Nation. It is a day of great opportunity for seniors all across our Nation. Today is the first day that seniors all across America are able to sign up voluntarily and participate in the new Medicare part D prescription drug program.

As many members of Congress know, I am a third-generation physician, and the things that were available to treat patients by my father and my grandfather have changed so significantly. The kinds of things that I was able to use to take care of patients were remarkably different than those that my father and grandfather were able to use. Medicine is an evolving science, and it changes almost daily.

But the Medicare program, like most government programs, has not kept up. When Medicare started 40 years ago, there really were very few medications that were able to be used to significantly alter the course of a disease or to prevent disease. But a lot of things have changed. Over the past 40 years, there are wonderful opportunities that have been created with the use of drug treatments and medications to prevent and cure diseases.

Yet Medicare, until now, has not covered a single medication. None. The Medicare system would cover, for example, the incredibly expensive surgery to take care of an ulcer, but it would not cover the medications to prevent the ulcer in the first place. That Medicare would cover, for example, the expensive hospitalization or potential surgery to treat an individual who had a stroke but would not cover the medications that were available to prevent a stroke, itself, does not make any sense at all. But all that is changing, and all of that is changing beginning today.

I want to stress that this is a voluntary program, a voluntary program for all seniors. Most seniors, if they look at the options available to them, will be helped significantly and assisted in their purchase and the ability to purchase medications by this new program.

Some might argue that much of this will be confusing, and it may be at the beginning. All kinds of programs that start anew oftentimes have many things that are confusing in them. However, I encourage my colleagues, both in Congress and in the medical

profession, to assist in educating seniors about the options that are available to them.

I have held a number of meetings around my district with seniors in an effort to try to educate them, and they have wonderful questions, will this program help me, how do I know that it will cover the medications that I have, how do I sign up, how do I get that information.

If I may pass along a couple of items, the first is the Medicare number: 1-800-Medicare. There are many individuals available at that line to be able to help seniors. Also, the Web site, www.medicare.gov. I was on it just this morning and it has a wealth of information available to folks.

In these meetings that I had, I always had somebody available from CMS, or the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services, with me to be able to help answer questions. But what I was most impressed with, in Georgia at least, the vast majority of seniors will be able to have a program that is better for them, covers more of their medications than they currently have with this Medicare program.

There are some important dates to remember. Today is the first date that is important. Today is the first day that seniors are able to sign up for a program whose coverage begins on January 1. This window of opportunity, that time to sign up, is between now, November 15, 2005, and May 15, 2006, even though the program begins on January 1.

Many seniors are currently receiving some prescription drug coverage now through a Medicare plus program or a supplemental program. I think it is important again for most seniors to appreciate that this program, the Medicare part D program, will be better for them than the current program that they have.

Again, 1-800-Medicare is the phone number. The Web site is www.medicare.gov. It is important that seniors look at the list of medications that they are currently taking and the list of medications that are available through the plans that are available to them and select one that is able to meld those that is going to cover the medications that they have.

It is an exciting time. It is a great opportunity for all seniors across our Nation. I encourage every senior to look at the options available to them and make certain that they are selecting a program that suits them best. I am hopeful that this will help improve the health care and the healthful status of all seniors across our Nation. I look forward to watching this program as it unfolds and as it evolves, and hopefully this will be an impetus to allow Medicare to be a much more nimble program.

PETER DRUCKER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Janu-

ary 4, 2005, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the passing of an incredible individual. He was a teacher and a friend of mine, and he was known to the world as the father of modern management. I am referring, of course, to Professor Peter Drucker, who passed away last Friday at his home in Claremont at the age of 95. When I spoke to his wonderful wife, Doris, early Saturday morning, the first thing she said, of course, was that Peter led an incredibly full life, which we all know that he did.

I was able to, as an undergraduate, because of this great structure at the Claremont colleges, that allows for cross registration among the six different colleges, to begin taking classes as an undergraduate with Professor Drucker. Then, of course, going on to the graduate university there, I did the same.

His words and his wisdom have had a profound effect on my strong beliefs and personal responsibility, free markets, the power of entrepreneurship and, of course, the very healthy and important skepticism of the effectiveness of sprawling government bureaucracies. I remember having dinner with him just a few years ago, and he was talking about an Italian observer who said the greatest threat to the future of Italy is efficient government. He was a genius, he was a genius who generously shared his talents, his kindness and his time with so many of us.

For a man of such unparalleled vision and capability, he had wonderfully disarming sense of humor and an amazing humility. He was a world-class thinker and a provocative, as we all know, prolific writer.

When he was just 23 years of age, living in Germany, he wrote an essay that was both outlawed and burned by the Nazis. When he was 30 years of age, his first book, *The End of Economic Man*, was made required reading for graduates of the British Officers' Candidate School by Winston Churchill. All told he wrote over 30 books that sold millions of copies around the globe and influenced business leaders, social pioneers and heads of state.

The great thing was that while he had the ears of the world's top leaders in both business and government, he maintained his strong commitment to teaching. He put great emphasis on individuals, and their contributions to large organizations and society. He saw employees as a company's most valuable resource, and in working together toward a defined goal, its greatest source of progress and change.

Mr. Speaker, I could not agree more. He also believed that the highest standards of ethics and morality were essential to both a successful enterprise and a vibrant society. Being a good corporate citizen was a duty on par and not at odds with maximizing profits.

Later in his career, he devoted much of his time to studying community organizations, because, in his words, the 21st century will be the century of the social sector organization. The more economy, money and information become global, the more community will matter. He donated his expertise to a wide range of organizations, the American Red Cross, the American Heart Association. The results of his advice and leadership have played a role in responding most recently to Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. His groundbreaking work resulted in many accolades and many opportunities to share his thoughts.

In 1987, Claremont named its graduate school of management in his honor. He was a regular economist for the *Wall Street Journal* for two decades, from 1975 to 1995. He was bestowed with 25 doctorates from universities in Europe and here in the United States.

In 1990, he created the Peter Drucker Foundation to bring together business and social leaders. One of the great thrills for me was I was able to be with Professor Drucker and his wonderful and extraordinarily talented wife, Doris, in the East Room of the White House when President Bush in 2002 bestowed the Medal of Freedom, the highest civilian award in our country, on Professor Drucker.

The *Economist Magazine*, one of my favorite publications, called him the greatest thinker management theory has ever produced. In his book, *Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, Dr. Drucker described entrepreneurs as those who create something new, something different. They change or transmute values. By his own definition, it is clear that Dr. Drucker was an intellectual entrepreneur.

I mentioned this dinner that I had with him just a few years ago. I had the thrill of spending 3 hours with him. We talked about the impact that he had on so many people. The *Los Angeles Times* recounted that great entrepreneur Jack Welch, who headed General Electric, as saying that the turning point in large part came for him when Professor Drucker asked him the question, if you were not doing exactly what you are doing today, would you begin doing it, which was a very, very important point in determining what the future of General Electric was going to be.

I also remember our former colleague Amo Houghton often quoting Peter Drucker when he said every brilliant idea ultimately degenerates to hard work. He was an amazing individual. He was a man of great warmth and accomplishment, and I will miss him personally, and I know the world is better because of his life.

My thoughts and prayers are with Doris and their wonderful children and grandchildren. I will simply say to Professor Drucker, thank you, thank you, thank you for everything that you have done to improve the quality of life for so many.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 50 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GINGREY) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord God Almighty, Creator of inalienable rights, guide the work of Congress and the personal decisions of all Americans today.

Having sworn an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States, help the Members of the House of Representatives to make sound judgments. Give them wisdom to shape common resolve of the most important issues facing the Nation and in need of proper legislation.

Lord, help all Americans to be true democratic citizens who can give an account of their commitment to human rights and abide by the rule of law.

May government leaders and citizens together seek personal excellence and the common good of all; so to give You glory now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2419) "An Act making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes."

MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE

(Mr. CARTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind seniors all across America that they can sign up for Medicare prescription drug coverage starting today, November 15. As of January 1, 2006, Medicare begins offering participants drug coverage for citizens 65 and older. Medicare will work with employers and unions to ensure that people who currently receive prescription drug coverage through their employer or union will continue to do so.

Like other insurance, if you join, you will pay a monthly premium, generally about \$37, plus a share of the cost of the prescriptions. Costs may be different, depending on the drug plan you choose. Plans will vary in the prescription drugs covered, how much you have to pay, and the pharmacies you can use.

All drug plans will have to provide at least a standard level of coverage which Medicare will set. Some plans may offer more coverage and additional drugs for higher monthly premiums. I encourage you to join the drug plan that best meets your needs.

MENTAL HEALTH PARITY

(Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, as of today, a bipartisan majority of the House has cosponsored the Paul Wellstone Mental Health Equity Treatment Act. This marks the fifth year in a row that the majority of our colleagues have supported ending this arbitrary insurance limit on the treatment of a whole category of what this poster makes clear are neurological, physical diseases.

In the last 5 years, more than 150,000 Americans have lost their lives to suicide, 90 percent of them with serious mental illness.

In the last 5 years, American employers have lost over \$150 billion of productivity to depression alone. That is more than the GDP of 28 different States during the same period.

In the 5 years, well over 60,000 American families have been broken apart by the absence of insurance because the only way for parents to get treatment for their children is to turn the custody of those children over to the State.

And, in those 5 years, Mr. Speaker, the leadership of this House and the committees of jurisdiction have yet to even give this bill an up and down vote. We need a vote on the Paul Wellstone Equity Act for mental health insurance.

TRIBUTE TO LANCE CORPORAL SCOTT ZUBOWSKI

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, Marines arrived at Barbara Weitzel's doorstep this Saturday at 5:30 p.m. in New Castle, Indiana. She said, my first question was, "Which one?" Two of her sons are Marines. Both are in Iraq.

She learned in that moment that her brave son, Lance Corporal Scott Zubowski, died in Iraq on 12 November 2005. While fighting to defend America and secure Iraq, he was a rear passenger traveling with four other soldiers near Fallujah when a roadside bomb exploded beneath his vehicle.

Scott and his family moved to New Castle in 1991 where he attended Greenstreet Elementary School for first and second grade. His teachers quickly recognized his gifts. They placed him in the gifted and talented program, an accelerated academic program at Sunnyside Elementary.

Scott did not grow up dreaming of a life in the military but, as is the case with younger brothers, he respected his older brother David. Sergeant David Zubowski enlisted in the Marines. Scott noticed the growing confidence in his brother, and he wanted to enlist as well, which he did after graduating from North Manchester High School in 2003.

Mr. Speaker, Lance Corporal Scott Zubowski is a hero. I offer my deepest condolences to his parents, Barbara Weitzel and Richard Zubowski; his lovely new wife, Klancey Zubowski; his two brothers, Brian and Sergeant David Zubowski; and all the family and friends who loved and admired this courageous young man.

Scott's mother recently told the hometown newspaper, "He gave himself for us, and we can't forget."

He did give himself, Mrs. Weitzel. No greater love has a man than this, that he should lay down his life for his friends. We will never forget your brave son.

AMERICANS DESERVE THE TRUTH REGARDING WAR IN IRAQ

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, last week, President Bush said it was irresponsible for people to rewrite the way the war began, and the White House communications director said the American people expect an honest debate. I could not agree with both statements more.

Then, yesterday, the President donned his flight jacket and suggested that he was going to attack his critics and, in fact, attacked his critics rather than contribute to the honest debate.

The American people need to know, after the dramatic failure of intelligence, just how that intelligence was

used, how it was emphasized, how it was manipulated, and who was the source of much of the intelligence that this administration used to hook people into the war in Iraq.

Did they use the intelligence provided by Mr. Chalabi, who was on our payroll, and by Mr. Chalabi's defectors, who paid and bribed to provide that intelligence to the administration? Did the administration, and this goes to the crux of the question: Did the administration do the due diligence that was necessary before they made the decision to put American men and women in harm's way into Iraq? Did they look at the case and make the case that this was an imminent threat to the security of the United States?

So far, we do not have the answers to those questions. We know that there was a concerted effort within the Department of Defense, within the administration to push us into the war in Iraq. We now need to know how that was done. We need that honest debate. We do not need the President to continue to attack his critics.

The American people are entitled to that debate. They are entitled to the results of the investigations that were promised 17 months ago, and nothing has happened from those investigations.

WORLD WAR I VETERAN KENNETH MEYERS

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, when Kenneth Meyers was born in 1889, Teddy Roosevelt was charging up San Juan Hill, the airplane had not been invented, and electricity was a novelty. Kenneth Meyers, at 107, is the oldest surviving World War I veteran in Texas. There are less than 50 World War I veterans in all of the United States.

Meyers joined the Navy as a teenager in 1917 and served aboard the Battleship *Oklahoma* in World War I until 1919. Meyers, who lives in Houston, says he was proud to serve in the "War to End All Wars."

After the Navy, Meyers earned his masters degree, became an agricultural expert for Uncle Sam, and even helped farmers as far away as Greece. He herded cattle in Wyoming, and he still owns land there.

As we honor American veterans, we appreciate the generations of sailors and doughboys in World War I who adopted the song "Over There" that states, in part, "Send the word to beware, that the Yanks are coming, the Yanks are coming and we won't come back 'til its over, over there."

Mr. Speaker, like warriors since then, those Yanks got the job done for freedom and only came back when it was over, over there. That's just the way it is.

MEDICARE MEETS SENIORS' NEEDS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Americans have benefited significantly from medical advancements throughout the past 40 years, and Medicare must also evolve with the changing technology.

Today marks an historic date for the Medicare program. For the first time, America's seniors will have the opportunity to enroll in a voluntary prescription drug benefit that will meet their needs.

I would like to encourage all seniors to sign up for this valuable benefit. For more information on how to register, and this is a special exclusive surprise for biased ABC News, seniors can call 1-800-Medicare or visit www.medicare.gov. Seniors can also contact professional pharmacists in their communities for additional details about the program.

By strengthening Medicare, President Bush and Congress have delivered a program to ensure America's seniors live healthier, happier, and longer.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11.

PREEMIE ACT

(Mr. GINGREY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of National Prematurity Awareness Day. I stand with parents and physicians, organizations and associations around our country that are working to draw attention to the serious and growing problem of premature birth.

Nearly 500,000 babies will be born prematurely this year. In my own State of Georgia, 342 premature babies will be born this week. It is a serious problem, one that is far too common. Unfortunately, in most cases, we do not know why it happens.

From my experience as an OB-GYN physician for nearly 30 years, I know the anxiety, confusion, frustration and concern that premature birth places on both the families as well as the medical system. That is why I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 2861, the PREEMIE Act, which was introduced by my friend and colleague from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. Speaker, I am here today not only to encourage my colleagues to cosponsor this important piece of legislation but also to let the women in our country know how important it is to talk to their doctors about the risk factors associated with pre-term birth. Together, we can work to find a solution to this very costly crisis.

NEW MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, can you imagine an insurance policy that paid thousands of dollars for the most expensive treatment for a disease but not a few hundred dollars for medicine to prevent that disease from occurring? Well, that is what Medicare has been, until now. Today is the first day that seniors all across our country can join Medicare part D.

As a physician, I am keenly aware that medications are a mainstay of the treatment and prevention of disease and, with this new prescription drug benefit, Medicare will now assist seniors in obtaining medicines that can prevent serious illness. Seniors should get more choices and better treatment, and America will get a Medicare system that moves into the 21st century.

In my district, I have held senior education seminars, trying to give seniors helpful information about this new and exciting program. This is not about politics, this is about helping those eligible for Medicare to select the plan that is best for them.

I encourage all of my colleagues in medicine and in Congress to help seniors as they have the opportunity to participate in a new health program, one that should result in a more rewarding and healthier life.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GINGREY). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah) at 2 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

YAKIMA-TIETON IRRIGATION DISTRICT CONVEYANCE ACT OF 2005

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1564) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain

buildings and lands of the Yakima Project, Washington, to the Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1564

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District Conveyance Act of 2005".

SEC. 2. CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN BUILDINGS AND LANDS OF THE YAKIMA PROJECT, WASHINGTON.

(a) CONVEYANCE REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Interior shall convey to the Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District, located in Yakima County, Washington, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the buildings and lands of the Yakima Project, Washington, in accordance with the terms and conditions set forth in the agreement titled "Agreement Between the United States and the Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District to Transfer Title to Certain Federally Owned Buildings and Lands, With Certain Property Rights, Title, and Interest, to the Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District" (Contract No. 5-07-10-L1658).

(b) LIABILITY.—Effective upon the date of conveyance under this section, the United States shall not be held liable by any court for damages of any kind arising out of any act, omission, or occurrence relating to the conveyed buildings and lands, except for damages caused by acts of negligence committed by the United States or by its employees or agents before the date of conveyance. Nothing in this section increases the liability of the United States beyond that provided in chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code (popularly known as the Federal Tort Claims Act), on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) BENEFITS.—After conveyance of the buildings and lands to the Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District under this section—

(1) such buildings and lands shall not be considered to be a part of a Federal reclamation project; and

(2) such irrigation district shall not be eligible to receive any benefits with respect to any buildings and lands conveyed, except benefits that would be available to a similarly situated person with respect to such buildings and lands that are not part of a Federal reclamation project.

(d) REPORT.—If the Secretary of the Interior has not completed the conveyance required under subsection (a) within 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that explains the reason such conveyance has not been completed and stating the date by which the conveyance will be completed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1564, sponsored by our colleague DOC HASTINGS, conveys 9 acres of federally owned land and administrative buildings to the Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District in Washington State. No project facilities such as dams, diversion structures, or canals are included in this title transfer.

The transfer has been in the works for almost a decade. This legislation, also introduced by the junior Senator from Washington, will enhance more private ownership and decrease the Federal Government's liability. It is a win for the local community and a win for the American taxpayer. I urge my colleagues to support this important bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the majority has already explained the legislation. I would only add that we on this side of the aisle have no objection to its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, my legislation would enable a long-awaited transfer of property to the Bureau of Reclamation to the Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District in central Washington. This transfer involves the conveyance of approximately 9 acres of Federal property as well as a few associated structures. These facilities are already dedicated to purposes related to the irrigation district. With this conveyance, the district will be able to use district funds to make needed improvements for the future. The irrigation district has fully repaid its obligations to the United States related to these properties, and the bureau is no longer interested in their day-to-day management and upkeep.

During hearings before the Resources Committee earlier this year, the administration expressed its support for this legislation and noted that this transfer allowed the bureau to focus its limited resources where they are more urgently needed. In my view, this is an example of local problem-solving at its best.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the staff of the irrigation district and the Bureau of Reclamation for their work on this. This legislation would not be before us today without their cooperative efforts over the last few years to negotiate this agreement. I also want to thank

Resources Chairman POMBO and Water and Power Subcommittee Chairman RADANOVICH for moving this legislation through the process, as well as Kiel Weaver and other members of the committee staff for their work on this bill.

Again, this is a noncontroversial conveyance of property agreed to by the irrigation district and the Bureau of Reclamation. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1564.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

FRANKLIN NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD STUDY ACT

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1972) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the suitability and feasibility of including in the National Park System certain sites in Williamson County, Tennessee, relating to the Battle of Franklin, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1972

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Franklin National Battlefield Study Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) STUDY AREA.—The term "study area" means the cities of Brentwood, Franklin, Triune, Thompson's Station, and Spring Hill, Tennessee.

SEC. 3. SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a special resource study of sites in the study area relating to the Battle of Franklin to determine—

(1) the national significance of the sites; and
(2) the suitability and feasibility of including the sites in the National Park System.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The study conducted under subsection (a) shall include the analysis and recommendations of the Secretary on—

(1) the effect on the study area of including the sites in the National Park System; and
(2) whether the sites could be included in an existing unit of the National Park System or other federally designated unit in the State of Tennessee.

(c) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall consult with—

(1) appropriate Federal agencies and State and local government entities; and

(2) interested groups and organizations.

(d) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—The study required under subsection (a) shall be conducted in accordance with Public Law 91–383 (16 U.S.C. 1a–1 et seq.).

SEC. 4. REPORT.

Not later than 3 years after the date funds are made available for the study, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report that describes—

(1) the findings of the study; and

(2) any conclusions and recommendations of the Secretary.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1972, introduced by Congresswoman MARSHA BLACKBURN, would direct the Secretary of the Interior to determine the suitability and feasibility of including sites related to the Battle of Franklin into the National Park System. This study area will include the cities of Brentwood, Franklin, Triune, Thompson's Station and Spring Hill, Tennessee. The Secretary will determine if the sites within the study area have national significance and if they may be included in an existing national park or another federally designated unit.

I urge adoption of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to congratulate both sponsors, including the cosponsor on this side, Congressman LINCOLN DAVIS, for their leadership in getting this bill to the floor today. The majority has already explained this legislation. I would only add that we on this side of the aisle also support it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking my

colleague, Congressman DAVIS, for his diligence and his attention to this matter. This addresses Williamson County, Tennessee, which he and I share the representation of. He and his staff have worked very closely with us to address this issue of looking at the Franklin battlefield.

By way of history, Mr. Speaker, on the afternoon of November 30, 1864, General Hood's Army of Tennessee marched down Winstead Hill in Franklin, Tennessee, and charged the Union forces of General Schofield. Fighting continued until late in the evening as both sides sustained heavy casualties. The following morning revealed the terrible consequences of the fighting that took place and how the battle became the darkest day of the Civil War. With over 9,000 dead soldiers and six dead Confederate generals, the battle would be the bloodiest battle of the Civil War and would sound the death knell of the Confederacy. The battle is known as the Battle of Franklin.

Mr. Speaker, the Battle of Franklin was one of the last significant battles leading to the Union victory over the Confederacy in the Civil War and has tremendous significance not only to our community but to American history. Yet there is neither a national cemetery nor a national battlefield park commemorating the battle. This bill is a first step toward preserving and protecting sites that contributed to this important Civil War landscape and achieving a solution to save the area as a national heritage through partnerships with the local communities.

It does, as the gentlewoman from Colorado said, direct the Secretary of the Interior to study sites in Williamson County, Tennessee, where portions of the Battle of Franklin took place or were related to the battle. The battlefield will serve as a memorial of the American citizens who fought and died for what they believed was right. I urge my colleagues' consideration on this bill. Again, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his support and assistance.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVIS), the cosponsor of the legislation.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1972, the Franklin National Battlefield Study Act. It is fitting that we protect this piece of American history by preserving this battlefield, home to the Battle of Franklin. As Roberts Hicks and Julian Bibb of Franklin's Charge put it best:

"What happened on the late afternoon and evening of November 30, 1864, was an epic display of courage and valor as troops on both sides gave their lives for causes they believed worthy and just. But the battle was much more. In essence, the Battle of Franklin was one of the most significant events in national unity, peace, and the end of slavery."

The Franklin battlefield might be one of the smallest battlefields in the United States, but it is also among the bloodiest. A staggering 9,000 soldiers were killed or wounded at Franklin, including the largest number of generals ever lost in any American battle. It was the largest infantry charge ever conducted in North America. In the 5 tragic hours that make up the Battle of Franklin, more men died in those 5 hours than the 19 hours on D-Day. Eleven Congressional Medals of Honor were earned at the Battle of Franklin.

The Civil War Sites Advisory Commission designated Franklin as one of just 45 principal battles having a direct, observable impact on the direction, duration, conduct, or outcome of the war. Marking the beginning of the end for the Western Theater of the Civil War, it is now listed among the country's Top 10 Most Endangered Civil War Battlefields by the Civil War Preservation Trust. I strongly support Representative BLACKBURN's legislation to correct this injustice. The Battle of Franklin is considered the beginning of the defeat of the Confederacy.

I applaud the efforts of Save the Franklin Battlefield, Incorporated; Mayor Miller of Franklin; Franklin's Charge; the Williamson County Historical Society; interested city and county leaders; and leading preservationists and conservation organizations that have sought to make this legislation a reality. It has been a delight to work with the gentlewoman from Tennessee on this particular issue, which is in her home district, a county that we both share.

I believe it is our duty to preserve this historical battlefield, and we are bound by the respect and homage we must pay for those who died to preserve the Nation we hold so dear and revere today. But this is also for our children and grandchildren who will now be able to experience a chapter in our Nation's history in a way that a textbook cannot provide.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1972, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1415

PECHANGA BAND OF LUISENO MISSION INDIANS LAND TRANSFER ACT OF 2005

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3507) to transfer certain land

in Riverside County, California, and San Diego County, California, from the Bureau of Land Management to the United States to be held in trust for the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3507

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians Land Transfer Act of 2005".

SEC. 2. TRANSFER OF LAND IN TRUST FOR PECHANGA BAND OF LUISENO MISSION INDIANS.

(a) TRANSFER AND ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) TRANSFER.—Effective on the date of the enactment of this Act and subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal lands described in subsection (b), including all improvements thereon, appurtenances thereto, and rights to all minerals thereon or therein, including oil and gas, water, and related resources, shall be held by the United States in trust for the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians, a federally recognized Indian tribe.

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—The transferred land shall be declared part of the Pechanga Indian Reservation and administered in accordance with—

(A) the laws and regulations generally applicable to property held in trust by the United States for an Indian tribe; and

(B) a memorandum of understanding entered into between the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The lands referred to in subsection (a) consist of approximately 990.74 acres in Riverside County, California, and San Diego County, California, as referenced on the map titled, "H.R. 4908, Pechanga Land Transfer Act" and dated September 13, 2004, which, before the transfer under such subsection, were administered by the Bureau of Land Management and are more particularly described as follows:

(1) Sections 29, 30, and 32 of township 8 south, range 2 west, San Bernardino base and meridian.

(2) Section 6 of township 9 south, range 2 west, San Bernardino base and meridian.

(3) Mineral Survey 3540, section 22 of township 5 south, range 4 west, San Bernardino base and meridian.

(c) SURVEY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Office of Cadastral Survey of the Bureau of Land Management shall complete a survey of the lands transferred under subsection (a) for the purpose of establishing the boundaries of the lands.

(d) MAP ON FILE.—The map referred to in subsection (b) shall be on file in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(e) LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—

(1) PUBLICATION.—On approval of the survey completed under subsection (c) by the duly elected tribal council of the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians, the Secretary of the Interior shall publish in the Federal Register—

(A) a legal description of the boundary lines; and

(B) legal description of the lands transferred under subsection (a).

(2) EFFECT.—Beginning on the date on which the legal descriptions are published under paragraph (1), such legal descriptions shall be the official legal descriptions of the

boundary lines and the lands transferred under subsection (a).

(f) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall—

(1) enlarge, impair, or otherwise affect any right or claim of the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians to any land or interest in land that is in existence before the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(2) affect any water right of the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians in existence before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(g) RESTRICTED USE OF TRANSFERRED LANDS.—The lands transferred under subsection (a) may be used only for the protection, preservation, and maintenance of the archaeological, cultural, and wildlife resources thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3507 is a non-controversial bill to transfer two parcels of public land to the Pechanga Band of Mission Indians. Located in Riverside County, California, these lands total 991 acres in size.

The lands subject to the transfer are currently administered by the Bureau of Land Management, but they contain archaeological, cultural and wildlife resources that are extremely valuable to the tribe.

In the last Congress, the Resources Committee held a hearing on a similar bill to transfer the same lands. In this hearing, both the tribe and the Interior Department testified that these lands belong in Tribal ownership.

After reporting that legislation, it was learned that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service had certain concerns relating to the management and use of the lands, and Congress adjourned before the problem could be resolved. These concerns have been addressed through a memorandum of understanding between the tribe and the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the sponsor of last year's bill has introduced H.R. 3507 to reference the MOU.

Because the lands are part of the Pechanga's ancient heritage, the tribe has adopted a resolution to zone them for conservation purposes. To reinforce the Tribe's intent, this bill requires the tribe to use the properties only for the protection and preservation of cultural, archaeological and wildlife resources.

The Pechanga Tribe should be commended for seeking to care for lands that are so important to preserving the heritage of its tribal members. In this spirit, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3507.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side on the aisle again have no objection to the passage of this bill for the Pechanga Tribe of California.

Resources Committee Ranking Member NICK RAHALL worked hard last Congress with the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) to have land put into trust for this tribe so they could preserve an area vital to their ceremonies and culture. We expect the tribe to manage this land in a similar manner and do not object to its consideration today.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer H.R. 3507, the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians Land Transfer Act of 2005, for final passage in the House. This bill will transfer approximately 990 acres of land currently being held by the Bureau of Land Management to the United States to be held in trust for the Pechanga tribe as apart of their reservation.

The Pechanga people have called the Temecula Valley, which is located in my district, their home for more than 10,000 years. They like to say that they have governed themselves and cared for their lands since time immemorial.

This bill transfers into trust land that has immense historical, archaeological, and cultural significance for the Pechanga tribe. It also includes a memorandum of understanding that has been agreed upon by the Pechanga Tribe and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. This M.O.U. provides restrictions that limit the use of this land to only preservation, protection and maintenance of its historical and cultural artifacts and its resources.

It is widely agreed that the BLM currently has more land in its possession than it can properly care for and maintain. I view the opportunity to return this mostly rocky hillside area to those who are willing and have the resources to provide proper maintenance and care for the land.

Mr. Speaker, the Pechanga have done an exemplary job of integrating and investing in their community, both on their reservation land and beyond. They have been good neighbors to the City of Temecula, and have demonstrated that they can properly care for and maintain Federal land transferred to their care.

I hope that my colleagues will join me today in voting to pass this bill out of the House.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3507, the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians Land Transfer Act of 2005.

The Pechanga Tribe has sought for years to acquire this land because of its importance as an ancestral burial site.

This bill demonstrates respect for the sovereignty of the tribe and recognizes the importance of preserving America's rich Native American Heritage.

It demonstrates respect for the sovereignty of tribes by ensuring that these lands are not

arbitrarily separated from their tribal community.

In 2002 I co-sponsored H.R. 3476 to protect the ancestral land of Great Oak Ranch because I understand the significance of these sites to both the tribe and the surrounding community.

In preserving these lands we show that we are aware of our Congressional responsibility to ensure that archaeological, historical, and cultural sites from America's Native American heritage are not taken from future generations.

We must continue the work begun today to restore and strengthen our awareness of America's rich Native American history.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3507.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLOWING USE OF CERTAIN ROADS WITHIN DELAWARE WATER GAP NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3721) to amend the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 to allow certain commercial vehicles to continue to use Route 209 within Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area and to allow the National Park Service to continue to collect fees from those vehicles, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3721

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. USE OF CERTAIN ROADS WITHIN DELAWARE WATER GAP.

Section 702 of Division I of the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-333; 110 Stat. 4185) is amended—

(1) by striking “2005” and inserting “2015, or whenever a feasible alternative exists, whichever comes first,” each place it appears; and

(2) by amending the last sentence in subsection (c)(2) to read as follows: “Such fee shall be set to fully cover the cost of operation of the road, but not to exceed \$40 per trip.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) and the gentleman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 3721, introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) and amended by the Resources Committee, would amend the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 to continue to permit certain commercial vehicles to utilize Route 209 within the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area in Pennsylvania as well as allow the National Park Service to continue to collect fees from these vehicles.

Since 1996, this route has become an increasingly important north-south artery connecting the two northeast Pennsylvania towns of Milford and Stroudsburg. While an alternate routes does exist outside the Recreation Area, the fact is that the route transverses a much more mountainous region and thus takes more time and is more dangerous, especially during the winter months. I urge adoption of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the majority has again already explained the purpose of H.R. 3721, which deals with truck traffic on a park road within the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area. The Congress has dealt with this issue on three different occasions in the past. It is our hope that this will be the last time we will need to address this subject.

Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to its adoption as amended by the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD).

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman POMBO and Ranking Member RAHALL for working with me to get H.R. 3721 on the suspension calendar and considered in an expeditious fashion.

At the request of the National Park Service, I introduced H.R. 3721 which would extend for 10 years the current authority for commercial vehicle traffic through the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area along Route 209. All bordering counties and boroughs are supportive of the bill.

In supporting the bill, the National Park Service cites the continuing need for commercial vehicle traffic to travel through the park in a manner that protects park resources and visitors while also providing the Water Gap Rec-

reational Area the financial means for monitoring and enforcement of commercial use restrictions.

The bill is needed to continue a program that has worked for the Park Service and the community surrounding the Water Gap National Recreation Area for over 20 years. The fee collection system resolved the potential problems raised when the 21-mile segment of U.S. Route 209 was transferred to Park Service control. The system allows limited commercial vehicle access, and the tolls allow the Park Service to monitor the road without using regular operation and maintenance budgets.

Authorization for the program was done in 10-year increments. The most recent 10-year increment authorization expired September 30. My bill would extend the authorization to September 30, 2015.

The current program has been in operation since 1983 and was largely successful until it started running a deficit. The main problem with the existing program is the lack of the ability for the park to adjust the fee schedule to cover the expense of operating the contact stations. This problem is resolved by authorizing the park superintendent to adjust fees as necessary to cover operating costs.

A reduction or elimination of commercial traffic is not feasible at this time as the commercial traffic continues to serve local businesses immediately adjacent to the park and is necessary for continued business operation within the area for another decade.

The management of U.S. Route 209, in accordance with this legislation, meets the goals of the park and is supported by the experience of the park, public sentiment, and economic analysis. On behalf of the National Park Service, I ask for your support for this legislation.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3721, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAND EXCHANGES, TAHOE NATIONAL FOREST, CALIFORNIA

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3981) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out certain land exchanges involving small parcels of National Forest System land in the Tahoe National Forest in the State of California, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3981

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. LAND EXCHANGES, TAHOE NATIONAL FOREST, CALIFORNIA.

(a) CHRISTENSEN EXCHANGE.—Notwithstanding section 3 of Public Law 97-465 (16 U.S.C. 521e; commonly known as the Small Tracts Act), the Secretary of Agriculture may use the authority of such Act to acquire land from Irving N. Christensen in that portion of the SW¼NW¼ of section 16, township 19 north, range 9 east, Mount Diablo meridian, lying southwest of California State Highway 49 and that portion of the S½NE¼ of section 17 of the same township and range lying southwest of California State Highway 49 and northeast of the North Fork Yuba River, through an exchange of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel National Forest System land in Tahoe National Forest, California, lying north of California State Highway 49 within the N½N½ of such section 17.

(b) MCCREARY EXCHANGE.—The Secretary of Agriculture may use the authority of provided by Public Law 97-465 (16 U.S.C. 521c et seq.; commonly known as the Small Tracts Act) to acquire land from Dennis W. McCreary and Cindy M. McCreary in lot 19 of section 35, township 20 north, range 10 east, Mount Diablo meridian, through an exchange of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel National Forest System land in Tahoe National Forest, California, in lot 121 of such section 35. For purposes of Public Law 97-465, this land exchange is deemed to involve a mineral survey fraction.

(c) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, all lands to be exchanged under this section are withdrawn from location, entry, and patent under the mining laws of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) and the gentleman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 3981, authored by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE), would facilitate the exchange of two small tracts of land under the Small Tracts Act in the Tahoe National Forest in California.

The first would exchange 3 acres of mineral rights from the Forest Service to the owner of the surface in exchange for 7 acres of land adjacent to a Forest Service campground. The second would provide for the exchange of less than 1 acre owned by the Forest Service and located in the backyard of the property

owner with a parcel of less than 1 acre near a Forest Service trailhead. The Forest Service has indicated its interest and support for these exchanges in correspondence to the landowners.

I urge you to support this important measure.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3981 directs the Secretary of Agriculture to exchange two small parcels of National Forest System land in the Tahoe National Forest in California. We do not object to the two land exchanges included in H.R. 3981.

We had concerns with an earlier version of this legislation, H.R. 1905, that included generic amendments to the Small Tracts Act, but those are not included in this bill, and we have no objection to H.R. 3981.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3981.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NORTHERN ARIZONA LAND EXCHANGE AND VERDE RIVER BASIN PARTNERSHIP ACT OF 2005

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 161) to provide for a land exchange in the State of Arizona between the Secretary of Agriculture and Yavapai Ranch Limited Partnership.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 161

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Northern Arizona Land Exchange and Verde River Basin Partnership Act of 2005”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—NORTHERN ARIZONA LAND EXCHANGE

Sec. 101. Definitions.

Sec. 102. Land exchange.

Sec. 103. Description of non-Federal land.

Sec. 104. Description of Federal land.

Sec. 105. Status and management of land after exchange.

Sec. 106. Miscellaneous provisions.

Sec. 107. Conveyance of additional land.

TITLE II—VERDE RIVER BASIN PARTNERSHIP

Sec. 201. Purpose.

Sec. 202. Definitions.

Sec. 203. Verde River Basin Partnership.

Sec. 204. Verde River Basin studies.

Sec. 205. Verde River Basin Partnership final report.

Sec. 206. Memorandum of understanding.

Sec. 207. Effect.

TITLE I—NORTHERN ARIZONA LAND EXCHANGE

SEC. 101. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) CAMP.—The term “camp” means Camp Pearlstein, Friendly Pines, Patterdale Pines, Pine Summit, Sky Y, and Young Life Lost Canyon camps in the State of Arizona.

(2) CITIES.—The term “cities” means the cities of Flagstaff, Williams, and Camp Verde, Arizona.

(3) FEDERAL LAND.—The term “Federal land” means the land described in section 104.

(4) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The term “non-Federal land” means the land described in section 103.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(6) YAVAPAI RANCH.—The term “Yavapai Ranch” means the Yavapai Ranch Limited Partnership, an Arizona Limited Partnership, and the Northern Yavapai, L.L.C., an Arizona Limited Liability Company.

SEC. 102. LAND EXCHANGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Upon the conveyance by Yavapai Ranch of title to the non-Federal land identified in section 103, the Secretary shall simultaneously convey to Yavapai Ranch title to the Federal land identified in section 104.

(2) Title to the lands to be exchanged shall be in a form acceptable to the Secretary and Yavapai Ranch.

(3) The Federal and non-Federal lands to be exchanged under this title may be modified prior to the exchange as provided in this title.

(4)(A) By mutual agreement, the Secretary and Yavapai Ranch may make minor and technical corrections to the maps and legal descriptions of the lands and interests therein exchanged or retained under this title, including changes, if necessary to conform to surveys approved by the Bureau of Land Management.

(B) In the case of any discrepancy between a map and legal description, the map shall prevail unless the Secretary and Yavapai Ranch agree otherwise.

(b) EXCHANGE PROCESS.—(1) Except as otherwise provided in this title, the land exchange under subsection (a) shall be undertaken in accordance with section 206 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 U.S.C. 1716).

(2) Before completing the land exchange under this title, the Secretary shall perform any necessary land surveys and pre-exchange inventories, clearances, reviews, and approvals, including those relating to hazardous materials, threatened and endangered species, cultural and historic resources, and wetlands and flood plains.

(c) EQUAL VALUE EXCHANGE.—(1) The value of the Federal land and the non-Federal land shall be equal, or equalized by the Secretary by adjusting the acreage of the Federal land in accordance with paragraph (2).

(2) If the final appraised value of the Federal land exceeds the final appraised value of the non-Federal land, prior to making other adjustments, the Federal lands shall be adjusted by deleting all or part of the parcels or portions of the parcels in the following order:

(A) A portion of the Camp Verde parcel described in section 104(a)(4), comprising approximately 316 acres, located in the Prescott National Forest, and more particularly described as lots 1, 5, and 6 of section 26, the NE¼NE¼ portion of section 26 and the N½N½ portion of section 27, Township 14

North, Range 4 East, Gila and Salt River Base and Meridian, Yavapai County, Arizona.

(B) A portion of the Camp Verde parcel described in section 104(a)(4), comprising approximately 314 acres, located in the Prescott National Forest, and more particularly described as lots 2, 7, 8, and 9 of section 26, the SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ portion of section 26, and the S $\frac{1}{2}$ N $\frac{1}{2}$ of section 27, Township 14 North, Range 4 East, Gila and Salt River Base and Meridian, Yavapai County, Arizona.

(C) Beginning at the south boundary of section 31, Township 20 North, Range 5 West, Gila and Salt River Base and Meridian, Yavapai County, Arizona, and sections 33 and 35, Township 20 North, Range 6 West, Gila and Salt River Base and Meridian, Yavapai County, Arizona, by adding to the non-Federal land to be conveyed to the United States in $\frac{1}{2}$ -section increments (E-W 64th line) while deleting from the conveyance to Yavapai Ranch Federal land in the same incremental portions of section 32, Township 20 North, Range 5 West, Gila and Salt River Base and Meridian, Yavapai County, Arizona, and sections 32, 34, and 36 in Township 20 North, Range 6 West, Gila and Salt River Base and Meridian, Yavapai County, Arizona, to establish a linear and continuous boundary that runs east-to-west across the sections.

(D) Any other parcels, or portions thereof, agreed to by the Secretary and Yavapai Ranch.

(3) If any parcel of Federal land or non-Federal land is not conveyed because of any reason, that parcel of land, or portion thereof, shall be excluded from the exchange and the remaining lands shall be adjusted as provided in this subsection.

(4) If the value of the Federal land exceeds the value of the non-Federal land by more than \$50,000, the Secretary and Yavapai Ranch shall, by mutual agreement, delete additional Federal land from the exchange until the value of the Federal land and non-Federal land is, to the maximum extent practicable, equal.

(d) APPRAISALS.—(1) The value of the Federal land and non-Federal land shall be determined by appraisals prepared in accordance with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions and the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

(2)(A) After the Secretary has reviewed and approved the final appraised values of the Federal land and non-Federal land to be exchanged, the Secretary shall not be required to reappraise or update the final appraised values before the completion of the land exchange.

(B) This paragraph shall apply during the three-year period following the approval by the Secretary of the final appraised values of the Federal land and non-Federal land unless the Secretary and Yavapai Ranch have entered into an agreement to implement the exchange.

(3) During the appraisal process, the appraiser shall determine the value of each parcel of Federal land and non-Federal land (including the contributory value of each individual section of the intermingled Federal and non-Federal land of the property described in sections 103(a) and 104(a)(1)) as an assembled transaction.

(4)(A) To ensure the timely and full disclosure to the public of the final appraised values of the Federal land and non-Federal land, the Secretary shall provide public notice of any appraisals approved by the Secretary and copies of such appraisals shall be available for public inspection in appropriate offices of the Prescott, Coconino, and Kaibab National Forests.

(B) The Secretary shall also provide copies of any approved appraisals to the cities and

the owners of the camps described in section 101(1).

(e) CONTRACTING.—(1) If the Secretary lacks adequate staff or resources to complete the exchange by the date specified in section 106(c), Yavapai Ranch, subject to the agreement of the Secretary, may contract with independent third-party contractors to carry out any work necessary to complete the exchange by that date.

(2) If, in accordance with this subsection, Yavapai Ranch contracts with an independent third-party contractor to carry out any work that would otherwise be performed by the Secretary, the Secretary shall reimburse Yavapai Ranch for the costs for the third-party contractors.

(f) EASEMENTS.—(1) The exchange of non-Federal and Federal land under this title shall be subject to any easements, rights-of-way, utility lines, and any other valid encumbrances in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, including acquired easements for water pipelines as generally depicted on the map entitled "Yavapai Ranch Land Exchange, YRLP Acquired Easements for Water Lines" dated August 2004, and any other reservations that may be agreed to by the Secretary and Yavapai Ranch.

(2) Upon completion of the land exchange under this title, the Secretary and Yavapai Ranch shall grant each other at no charge reciprocal easements for access and utilities across, over, and through—

(A) the routes depicted on the map entitled "Yavapai Ranch Land Exchange, Road and Trail Easements, Yavapai Ranch Area" dated August 2004; and

(B) any relocated routes that are agreed to by the Secretary and Yavapai Ranch.

(3) An easement described in paragraph (2) shall be unrestricted and non-exclusive in nature and shall run with and benefit the land.

(g) CONVEYANCE OF FEDERAL LAND TO CITIES AND CAMPS.—(1) Prior to the completion of the land exchange between Yavapai Ranch and the Secretary, the cities and the owners of the camps may enter into agreements with Yavapai Ranch whereby Yavapai Ranch, upon completion of the land exchange, will convey to the cities or the owners of the camps the applicable parcel of Federal land or portion thereof.

(2) If Yavapai Ranch and the cities or camp owners have not entered into agreements in accordance with paragraph (1), the Secretary shall, on notification by the cities or owners of the camps no later than 30 days after the date the relevant approved appraisal is made publicly available, delete the applicable parcel or portion thereof from the land exchange between Yavapai Ranch and the United States as follows:

(A) Upon request of the City of Flagstaff, Arizona, the parcels, or portion thereof, described in section 104(a)(2).

(B) Upon request of the City of Williams, Arizona, the parcels, or portion thereof, described in section 104(a)(3).

(C) Upon request of the City of Camp Verde, Arizona, a portion of the parcel described in section 104(a)(4), comprising approximately 514 acres located southeast of the southeastern boundary of the I-17 right-of-way, and more particularly described as the SE $\frac{1}{4}$ portion of the southeast quarter of section 26, the E $\frac{1}{2}$ and the E $\frac{1}{2}$ W $\frac{1}{2}$ portions of section 35, and lots 5 through 7 of section 36, Township 14 North, Range 4 East, Gila and Salt River Base and Meridian, Yavapai County, Arizona.

(D) Upon request of the owners of the Younglife Lost Canyon camp, the parcel described in section 104(a)(5).

(E) Upon request of the owner of Friendly Pines Camp, Patterdale Pines Camp, Camp Pearlstein, Pine Summit, or Sky Y Camp, as

applicable, the corresponding parcel described in section 104(a)(6).

(3)(A) Upon request of the specific city or camp referenced in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall convey to such city or camp all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the applicable parcel of Federal land or portion thereof, upon payment of the fair market value of the parcel and subject to any terms and conditions the Secretary may require.

(B) A conveyance under this paragraph shall not require new administrative or environmental analyses or appraisals beyond those prepared for the land exchange.

(4) A city or owner of a camp purchasing land under this subsection shall reimburse Yavapai Ranch for any costs incurred which are directly associated with surveys and appraisals of the specific property conveyed.

(5) A conveyance of land under this subsection shall not affect the timing of the land exchange.

(6) Nothing in this subsection limits the authority of the Secretary or Yavapai Ranch to delete any of the parcels referenced in this subsection from the land exchange.

(7)(A) The Secretary shall deposit the proceeds of any sale under paragraph (2) in a special account in the fund established under Public Law 90-171 (commonly known as the "Sisk Act") (16 U.S.C. 484a).

(B) Amounts deposited under subparagraph (A) shall be available to the Secretary, without further appropriation, to be used for the acquisition of land in the State of Arizona for addition to the National Forest System, including the land to be exchanged under this title.

SEC. 103. DESCRIPTION OF NON-FEDERAL LAND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The non-Federal land referred to in this title consists of approximately 35,000 acres of privately-owned land within the boundaries of the Prescott National Forest, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Yavapai Ranch Land Exchange, Non-Federal Lands", dated August 2004.

(b) EASEMENTS.—(1) The conveyance of non-Federal land to the United States under section 102 shall be subject to the reservation of—

(A) water rights and perpetual easements that run with and benefit the land retained by Yavapai Ranch for—

(i) the operation, maintenance, repair, improvement, development, and replacement of not more than 3 wells in existence on the date of enactment of this Act;

(ii) related storage tanks, valves, pumps, and hardware; and

(iii) pipelines to point of use; and

(B) easements for reasonable access to accomplish the purposes of the easements described in subparagraph (A).

(2) Each easement for an existing well referred to in paragraph (1) shall be 40 acres in area, and to the maximum extent practicable, centered on the existing well.

(3) The United States shall be entitled to one-half the production of each existing or replacement well, not to exceed a total of 3,100,000 gallons of water annually for National Forest System purposes.

(4) The locations of the easements and wells shall be as generally depicted on the map entitled "Yavapai Ranch Land Exchange, Reserved Easements for Water Lines and Wells", dated August 2004.

SEC. 104. DESCRIPTION OF FEDERAL LAND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Federal land referred to in this title consists of the following:

(1) Certain land comprising approximately 15,300 acres located in the Prescott National Forest, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Yavapai Ranch Land Exchange, Yavapai Ranch Area Federal Lands", dated August 2004.

(2) Certain land located in the Coconino National Forest—

(A) comprising approximately 1,500 acres as generally depicted on the map entitled “Yavapai Ranch Land Exchange, Flagstaff Federal Lands Airport Parcel”, dated August 2004; and

(B) comprising approximately 28.26 acres in two separate parcels, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Yavapai Ranch Land Exchange, Flagstaff Federal Lands Wetzel School and Mt. Elden Parcels”, dated August 2004.

(3) Certain land located in the Kaibab National Forest, and referred to as the Williams Airport, Williams golf course, Williams Sewer, Buckskinner Park, Williams Railroad, and Well parcels number 2, 3, and 4, cumulatively comprising approximately 950 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Yavapai Ranch Land Exchange, Williams Federal Lands”, dated August 2004.

(4) Certain land located in the Prescott National Forest, comprising approximately 2,200 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Yavapai Ranch Land Exchange, Camp Verde Federal Land General Crook Parcel”, dated August 2004.

(5) Certain land located in the Kaibab National Forest, comprising approximately 237.5 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Yavapai Ranch Land Exchange, Younglife Lost Canyon”, dated August 2004.

(6) Certain land located in the Prescott National Forest, including the “Friendly Pines”, “Patterdale Pines”, “Camp Pearlstein”, “Pine Summit”, and “Sky Y” camps, cumulatively comprising approximately 200 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Yavapai Ranch Land Exchange, Prescott Federal Lands, Summer Youth Camp Parcels”, dated August 2004.

(b) **CONDITION OF CONVEYANCE OF CAMP VERDE PARCEL.**—(1) To conserve water in the Verde Valley, Arizona, and to minimize the adverse impacts from future development of the Camp Verde General Crook parcel described in subsection (a)(4) on current and future holders of water rights in existence of the date of enactment of this Act and the Verde River and National Forest System lands retained by the United States, the United States shall limit in perpetuity the use of water on the parcel by reserving conservation easements that—

(A) run with the land;

(B) prohibit golf course development on the parcel;

(C) require that any public park or greenbelt on the parcel be watered with treated wastewater;

(D) limit total post-exchange water use on the parcel to not more than 300 acre-feet of water per year;

(E) provide that any water supplied by municipalities or private water companies shall count towards the post-exchange water use limitation described in subparagraph (D); and

(F) except for water supplied to the parcel by municipal water service providers or private water companies, require that any water used for the parcel not be withdrawn from wells perforated in the saturated Holocene alluvium of the Verde River.

(2) If Yavapai Ranch conveys the Camp Verde parcel described in subsection (a)(4), or any portion thereof, the terms of conveyance shall include a recorded and binding agreement of the quantity of water available for use on the land conveyed, as determined by Yavapai Ranch, except that total water use on the Camp Verde parcel may not exceed the amount specified in paragraph (1)(D).

(3) The Secretary may enter into a memorandum of understanding with the State or

political subdivision of the State to enforce the terms of the conservation easement.

SEC. 105. STATUS AND MANAGEMENT OF LAND AFTER EXCHANGE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Land acquired by the United States under this title shall become part of the Prescott National Forest and shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with this title and the laws applicable to the National Forest System.

(b) **GRAZING.**—Where grazing on non-Federal land acquired by the Secretary under this title occurs prior to the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary may manage the land to allow for continued grazing use, in accordance with the laws generally applicable to domestic livestock grazing on National Forest System land.

(c) **TIMBER HARVESTING.**—(1) After completion of the land exchange under this title, except as provided in paragraph (2), commercial timber harvesting shall be prohibited on the non-Federal land acquired by the United States.

(2) Timber harvesting may be conducted on the non-Federal land acquired under this title if the Secretary determines that such harvesting is necessary—

(A) to prevent or control fires, insects, and disease through forest thinning or other forest management techniques;

(B) to protect or enhance grassland habitat, watershed values, native plants and wildlife species; or

(C) to improve forest health.

SEC. 106. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

(a) **REVOCATION OF ORDERS.**—Any public orders withdrawing any of the Federal land from appropriation or disposal under the public land laws are revoked to the extent necessary to permit disposal of the Federal land.

(b) **WITHDRAWAL OF FEDERAL LAND.**—Subject to valid existing rights, the Federal land is withdrawn from all forms of entry and appropriation under the public land laws; location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and operation of the mineral leasing and geothermal leasing laws, until the date on which the land exchange is completed.

(c) **COMPLETION OF EXCHANGE.**—It is the intent of Congress that the land exchange authorized and directed under this title be completed not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 107. CONVEYANCE OF ADDITIONAL LAND.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall convey to a person that represents the majority of landowners with encroachments on the lot by quitclaim deed the parcel of land described in subsection (b).

(b) **DESCRIPTION OF LAND.**—The parcel of land referred to in subsection (a) is lot 8 in section 11, T. 21 N., R. 7 E., Gila and Salt River Base and Meridian, Coconino County, Arizona.

(c) **AMOUNT OF CONSIDERATION.**—In exchange for the land described in subsection (b), the person acquiring the land shall pay to the Secretary consideration in the amount of—

(1) \$2500; plus

(2) any costs of re-monumenting the boundary of land.

(d) **TIMING.**—(1) Not later than 90 days after the date on which the Secretary receives a power of attorney executed by the person acquiring the land, the Secretary shall convey to the person the land described in subsection (b).

(2) If, by the date that is 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary does not receive the power of attorney described in paragraph (1)—

(A) the authority provided under this section shall terminate; and

(B) any conveyance of the land shall be made under Public Law 97-465 (16 U.S.C. 521c et seq.).

TITLE II—VERDE RIVER BASIN PARTNERSHIP

SEC. 201. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to authorize assistance for a collaborative and science-based water resource planning and management partnership for the Verde River Basin in the State of Arizona, consisting of members that represent—

(1) Federal, State, and local agencies; and

(2) economic, environmental, and community water interests in the Verde River Basin.

SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **DIRECTOR.**—The term “Director” means the Director of the Arizona Department of Water Resources.

(2) **PARTNERSHIP.**—The term “Partnership” means the Verde River Basin Partnership.

(3) **PLAN.**—The term “plan” means the plan for the Verde River Basin required by section 204(a)(1).

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(5) **STATE.**—The term “State” means the State of Arizona.

(6) **VERDE RIVER BASIN.**—The term “Verde River Basin” means the land area designated by the Arizona Department of Water Resources as encompassing surface water and groundwater resources, including drainage and recharge areas with a hydrologic connection to the Verde River.

(7) **WATER BUDGET.**—The term “water budget” means the accounting of—

(A) the quantities of water leaving the Verde River Basin—

(i) as discharge to the Verde River and tributaries;

(ii) as subsurface outflow;

(iii) as evapotranspiration by riparian vegetation;

(iv) as surface evaporation;

(v) for agricultural use; and

(vi) for human consumption; and

(B) the quantities of water replenishing the Verde River Basin by precipitation, infiltration, and subsurface inflows.

SEC. 203. VERDE RIVER BASIN PARTNERSHIP.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may participate in the establishment of a partnership, to be known as the “Verde River Basin Partnership”, made up of Federal, State, local governments, and other entities with responsibilities and expertise in water to coordinate and cooperate in the identification and implementation of comprehensive science-based policies, projects, and management activities relating to the Verde River Basin.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—On establishment of the Partnership, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary and the Secretary of the Interior such sums as are necessary to carry out the activities of the Partnership for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

SEC. 204. VERDE RIVER BASIN STUDIES.

(a) **STUDIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Partnership shall prepare a plan for conducting water resource studies in the Verde River Basin that identifies—

(A) the primary study objectives to fulfill water resource planning and management needs for the Verde River Basin; and

(B) the water resource studies, hydrologic models, surface and groundwater monitoring networks, and other analytical tools helpful in the identification of long-term water supply management options within the Verde River Basin.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—At a minimum, the plan shall—

(A) include a list of specific studies and analyses that are needed to support Partnership planning and management decisions;

(B) identify any ongoing or completed water resource or riparian studies that are relevant to water resource planning and management for the Verde River Basin;

(C) describe the estimated cost and duration of the proposed studies and analyses; and

(D) designate as a study priority the compilation of a water budget analysis for the Verde Valley.

(b) VERDE VALLEY WATER BUDGET ANALYSIS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, not later than 14 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the U.S. Geological Survey, in cooperation with the Director, shall prepare and submit to the Partnership a report that provides a water budget analysis of the portion of the Verde River Basin within the Verde Valley.

(2) COMPONENTS.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) a summary of the information available on the hydrologic flow regime for the portion of the Middle Verde River from the Clarkdale streamgaging station to the city of Camp Verde at United States Geological Survey Stream Gauge 09506000;

(B) with respect to the portion of the Middle Verde River described in subparagraph (A), estimates of—

(i) the inflow and outflow of surface water and groundwater;

(ii) annual consumptive water use; and

(iii) changes in groundwater storage; and

(C) an analysis of the potential long-term consequences of various water use scenarios on groundwater levels and Verde River flows.

(c) PRELIMINARY REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 16 months after the date of enactment of this Act, using the information provided in the report submitted under subsection (b) and any other relevant information, the Partnership shall submit to the Secretary, the Governor of Arizona, and representatives of the Verde Valley communities, a preliminary report that sets forth the findings and recommendations of the Partnership regarding the long-term available water supply within the Verde Valley.

(2) CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Secretary may take into account the recommendations included in the report submitted under paragraph (1) with respect to decisions affecting land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary, including any future sales or exchanges of Federal land in the Verde River Basin after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) EFFECT.—Any recommendations included in the report submitted under paragraph (1) shall not affect the land exchange process or the appraisals of the Federal land and non-Federal land conducted under sections 103 and 104.

SEC. 205. VERDE RIVER BASIN PARTNERSHIP FINAL REPORT.

Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Partnership shall submit to the Secretary and the Governor of Arizona a final report that—

(1) includes a summary of the results of any water resource assessments conducted under this title in the Verde River Basin;

(2) identifies any areas in the Verde River Basin that are determined to have groundwater deficits or other current or potential water supply problems;

(3) identifies long-term water supply management options for communities and water resources within the Verde River Basin; and

(4) identifies water resource analyses and monitoring needed to support the implementation of management options.

SEC. 206. MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.

The Secretary (acting through the Chief of the Forest Service) and the Secretary of the Interior, shall enter into a memorandum of understanding authorizing the United States Geological Survey to access Forest Service land (including stream gauges, weather stations, wells, or other points of data collection on the Forest Service land) to carry out this title.

SEC. 207. EFFECT.

Nothing in this title diminishes or expands State or local jurisdiction, responsibilities, or rights with respect to water resource management or control.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

S. 161, introduced by Senator MCCAIN, provides for a land exchange in the State of Arizona between the Secretary of Agriculture and the Yavapai Ranch Limit Partnership.

This bill would consolidate the largest remaining checkerboard ownership in Arizona. The Forest Service will receive 35,000 acres of land and the Yavapai Ranch Limited Partnership would receive approximately 21,000 acres of land.

This legislation also creates the Verde River Basin Partnership to help resolve water issues. The goal of this collaborative group is to develop a water resource management plan and submit this plan to the Secretary of the Interior and the Governor of Arizona.

Nothing in this section would undermine State and local water laws. In fact, this legislation's partnership is simply a forum for planning and working together on the Verde Basin's pressing water issues. As such, there is a very serious expectation that the partnership will reach out to everyone in the basin's communities as it creates its plan. Holding town meetings, meeting with all levels of local government, and releasing draft documents for the general public's comment are just three items that the partnership is expected to perform.

I am confident that the partnership will truly be accountable to the local community who lives in the backyard of the Verde River. These local citizens have asked for and deserve the very best in having their voices heard and

this legislation will meet that need. I urge adoption of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1430

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 161 directs the Secretary of Agriculture to provide for a land exchange of various parcels between the United States Forest Service and the Yavapai Ranch Limited Partnership in Arizona.

While S. 161 is not ideal, it is an improvement upon legislation considered by the House in the past.

Specifically, efforts were made to address water use concerns with the Camp Verde parcel, lowering the watering use limitation from 700 acre feet per year to 300 acre feet per year. Furthermore, a parcel in the city of Cottonwood was removed from this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we, therefore, have no objections to S. 161.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Colorado for the time.

Mr. Speaker, S. 161 provides for a Federal land exchange that places some 35,000 acres of pristine ponderosa pine forest land and biologically diverse land, much of which borders an existing wilderness area, in the hands of the Forest Service.

This bill has been carefully crafted to ensure that the environment, ecosystem, watershed, and forest lands of northern Arizona are protected and preserved. I would particularly like to commend my colleague from Arizona, Congressman RICK RENZI of the first district, for his very hard work on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I know that we work here in a deliberative body, but it is not an overstatement to say that this bill has been a long time coming. Over half a decade ago, I originally introduced this bill in the House, working closely with my good friend, the late Bob Stump.

For several years now, details of this bill have been negotiated and many compromises made on all sides in order to come up with this legislation entertained on the floor of the people's House today. I do not believe that it gives every party everything they wanted, but it shows that the overarching goal of preserving forest land and doing something good for small towns and communities in Arizona has been given the highest priority by all parties involved.

The concept of a land exchange to consolidate the Yavapai Ranch lands just makes sense. Through this land exchange, the Federal Government will

receive environmentally sensitive, pristine forest lands that truly belong under the stewardship of the U.S. Forest Service to be preserved for future generations.

This exchange was originally initiated by the Forest Service to consolidate the largest remaining checkerboard parcel of land in Arizona and to protect the Juniper Mountains forested area from future development. Watershed management, wildlife habitat, and outdoor recreation in the consolidated land parcel will be preserved through this action.

Many of the land parcels the Forest Service will trade to accomplish these goals are eagerly sought by local communities for a variety of worthwhile civic purposes, including expansion of airports, parks, and other municipal facilities. Also, six summer camps that currently lease lands from the Forest Service will acquire those leased areas.

There has been considerable participation of local elected officials, Forest Service personnel, private citizens, and various citizen groups from northern Arizona and Arizona's Verde Valley in drafting this legislation. Their input and perspectives have proven invaluable, and I am confident that the bill now put forth by my colleague from Arizona addresses every major concern that has been brought forward.

This bill makes good common sense for our forests and for our people of Arizona. The cost savings for the Federal Government and, therefore, for American taxpayers associated with this land exchange are significant. The savings are accomplished through consolidation of Federal lands that allows for much greater ease in forest management.

But much more important, this exchange will ensure that one of the last largest pristine forested parcels in Arizona will pass out of private hands and be protected from potentially harmful development indefinitely.

It will prove good for this generation of Arizonans, future generations of Arizonans and for all Americans, and I join my colleagues from both Colorado and the Virgin Islands in urging passage of this legislation.

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 161, the Northern Arizona Land Exchange and Verde River Basin Partnership Act. This legislation facilitates a land exchange in northern Arizona of private land within the Yavapai Ranch for Forest Service land in the northern portion of the state and establishes a water resource planning and management partnership in the Verde River Basin.

This legislation accomplishes several goals in northern Arizona. First, it will preserve the pristine areas within Yavapai Ranch for wildlife and recreation, by consolidating a 110 square mile area in the Prescott National Forest. This area is adjacent to the Juniper Mesa Wilderness Area and will help preserve precious habitat for ponderosa pine, alligator juniper and pronghorn antelope.

Second, the bill provides the City of Flagstaff with the opportunity to acquire land to expand and improve Pulliam Airport. This legisla-

tion will allow the City of Flagstaff to develop a new city park and recreational areas and obtain ownership of land near their water treatment plant. This is critical to the City of Flagstaff's future by providing economic development and affordable housing.

The Northern Arizona Land Exchange Act will also allow the City of Williams to acquire land for its well sites, water storage tanks and wastewater facility and drinking water treatment plants. Until recently, the City of Williams relied completely on surface water supplies to service the community, however, surface water reservoirs in Williams are well below their needed capacity. This legislation will assist Williams in meeting their water challenges in the future by providing new land for well drilling sites.

Finally, this legislation ensures that six summer youth camps, serving between 10 and 12 thousand children a year, have the opportunity to acquire the land and benefit from full ownership and management of this land.

S. 161 ensures that stringent water conservation and water use restrictions must be met for any future development. In addition, any development must also comply with the State of Arizona's surface and ground water laws, as well as local community planning standards.

This legislation also creates the Verde River Basin Partnership to help resolve water issues. The goal of this collaborative group is to develop a water resource management plan and submit this plan to the Secretary of the Interior and the Governor of Arizona.

Nothing in this section will undermine state and local water laws. In fact, this legislation's partnership is simply a forum for planning and working together on the Verde Basin's pressing water issues. As such, there is a very serious expectation that the Partnership will reach out to everyone in the Basin's communities as it creates its Plan. Holding town meetings, meeting with all levels of local government and releasing draft documents for the general public's comment are just three items that the Partnership is expected to perform.

I am confident that the Partnership will truly be accountable to the local communities who live in the backyard of the Verde River. These local citizens have asked for and deserve the very best in having their voices heard and the legislation will meet that need.

This legislation will benefit the public, the many communities and camps in northern Arizona that will receive opportunities for future economic development, and the natural beauty of the Yavapai Ranch. In addition, the science-based water resource planning and management partnership created by this legislation will provide much-needed research in this sensitive area. Bringing the Yavapai Ranch into federal ownership is in the best interest of the public, and the Forest Service has indicated that it would otherwise be unable to acquire these parcels.

I urge my colleagues to support S. 161, the Northern Arizona Land Exchange Act and Verde River Basin Partnership Act.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 161.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE STUDY REGARDING CASTLE NUGENT FARMS

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 318) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating Castle Nugent Farms located on St. Croix, Virgin Islands, as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 318

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. NATIONAL PARK SERVICE STUDY REGARDING CASTLE NUGENT FARMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Castle Nugent Farms, located on the southeastern shore of St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands, is the largest parcel of privately-held land in the Virgin Islands and has been an operating cattle ranch for 50 years.

(2) This land has the largest and healthiest fringing coral reef anywhere in the Virgin Islands.

(3) It consists of Caribbean dry forest and pasturelands with considerable cultural resources including both pre-Columbian and post-European settlement.

(4) Castle Nugent Farms contains a large historic 17th century Danish estate house that sits on over 4 miles of pristine Caribbean oceanfront property.

(5) In addition to being an area for turtle nesting and night heron nesting, it is the home for the Senepol cattle breed, a unique breed of cattle that was developed on St. Croix in the early 1900's to adapt to the island's climate.

(b) STUDY.—The Secretary of the Interior shall carry out a study regarding the suitability and feasibility of designating Castle Nugent Farms as a unit of the National Park System.

(c) STUDY PROCESS AND COMPLETION.—Section 8(c) of Public Law 91-383 (16 U.S.C. 1a-5(c)) shall apply to the conduct and completion of the study required by this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

H.R. 318, introduced by my Resources Committee colleague DONNA CHRISTENSEN of the U.S. Virgin Islands, would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the Castle Nugent Farms located on St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands, as a unit of the National Park System. I understand that the owners of the farm, the largest parcel of privately held land in the United States Virgin Islands, are aware of this legislation and support the national park study.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 318 is supported by the majority and minority of the Resources Committee and the administration. Additionally, identical legislation was passed by the House in the 108th Congress.

I urge adoption of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the House today is considering H.R. 318, legislation that I introduced to provide for a study to determine the feasibility and suitability of designating Castle Nugent Farms in the United States Virgin Islands as a unit of the National Park System.

Castle Nugent Farms is a unique 1,350-acre property located on the southeastern shore of my home island of St. Croix. It contains natural and cultural resources which could provide an unparalleled insight into the plantation period of the Virgin Islands.

Castle Nugent Farms is presently operated as a cattle ranch by owners who are very interested in preserving and interpreting the natural and cultural resources of the area. Caroline Gasperi, whose family members have been stewards of this land for more than 50 years, has been an enthusiastic supporter for the preservation of this site. The passage of this bill today would bring her one step closer to her long-held and also hard-fought-for dream.

The owners are justifiably proud of their ranch, which contains more than 4 miles of pristine oceanfront with a large and healthy fringing coral reef. The interior of the property consists of Caribbean dry forest and pasture lands with cultural resources from both pre-Colombian and post-European settlement.

A large Danish estate house, dating to the 1730s, sits on the property. That house is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

At various points in its history, Castle Nugent Farm has been operated as a cotton plantation and a sugar cane plantation. Its current use as a cattle ranch involves raising unique Senepol cattle, a breed which is well suited to the climate and vegetation of the area.

H.R. 318 is a noncontroversial bill. Identical language, as we have heard, passed the House in the last Congress. The National Park Service has no objections to the legislation, and the

property's owners not only support a park study of the site but are enthusiastic about the opportunity to preserve the natural and cultural resources of the farm.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the park study will provide the blueprint by which we can preserve and interpret this unique piece of island history and resources for the benefit of present and future generations.

I thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for their support, and I strongly support the adoption of this bill by the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 318.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BOB HOPE MEMORIAL LIBRARY

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 323) to redesignate the Ellis Island Library on the third floor of the Ellis Island Immigration Museum, located on Ellis Island in New York Harbor, as the "Bob Hope Memorial Library".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 322

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REDESIGNATION.

The Ellis Island Library on the third floor of the Ellis Island Immigration Museum, located on Ellis Island in New York Harbor, shall be known and redesignated as the "Bob Hope Memorial Library".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Ellis Island Library on the third floor of the Ellis Island Immigration Museum referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Bob Hope Memorial Library".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

H.R. 323, introduced by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), designates the library on the third floor of the Ellis Island museum as the Bob Hope Memorial Library.

Bob Hope arrived as an immigrant to Ellis Island in 1908 at the age of 4. Later, he became one of the country's greatest entertainers and was sometimes referred to as "America's most famous immigrant."

H.R. 323 simply renames the library on the third floor of the immigration station museum. The Hope family is supportive of the effort to redesignate the library.

I urge adoption of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the majority has already explained pretty much the purpose of H.R. 323, which was introduced by our colleague from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Bob Hope and his family immigrated to the United States in 1908, and like millions of other immigrants entered the United States through Ellis Island. As all of us know and many of us have had the opportunity to enjoy, Bob Hope went on to have an illustrious career as a comedic entertainer and is remembered by many for his work over nearly six decades traveling the globe to entertain American servicemen and -women.

Mr. Speaker, we wholeheartedly support H.R. 323 as a means to honor the contributions of a great entertainer and great American and urge the adoption of the legislation by the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to our colleague from New York (Mr. ENGEL), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands for yielding time to me, and I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado as well and I want to thank the Speaker for the opportunity to talk about H.R. 323, which is what was mentioned before, a bill which will name the third-floor library at Ellis Island in New York Harbor as the Bob Hope Memorial Library.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY) for his assistance and support of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, most Americans remember Bob Hope for his work in the entertainment business, as a comedian, actor, dancer, singer, as well as his work with American troops abroad; but what few know or remember about Bob Hope is that he was an immigrant from England.

The gentlewoman mentioned he came to the United States when he was only

4 years old, and certainly he is referred to as America's most famous immigrant whose life epitomizes the American Dream.

I would like to also take this opportunity to vent my frustration a little bit with the National Park Service and its handling of this legislation.

We need to pass this bill. I read in Congressional Quarterly that the National Park Service does not support the bill on the grounds that Bob Hope's journey through Ellis Island and his life's accomplishments may not be enough to warrant renaming the island's library in his honor.

I want to say that they presented that same sort of testimony before the committee; and the committee had the good sense, in a bipartisan fashion, to reject that kind of thinking, because this is something that is very deserving for Bob Hope because, after all, it is Bob Hope. Everyone knows Bob Hope and everyone knows what he stood for. Bob Hope embodies the American Dream, and the Ellis Island Restoration Commission even called naming the library a fitting tribute.

After a long period of restoration, Ellis Island was turned into a museum in 1990 for people to come and remember the 16 million immigrants who passed through Ellis Island from 1892 to 1954 to pursue the American Dream.

□ 1445

When I talk about Ellis Island and the immigrants who came through Ellis Island, it is very personal because all four of my grandparents came through Ellis Island, and so many Americans had family coming through Ellis Island. It is estimated that some 40 percent of the current United States population has roots in Ellis Island. So this is a very fitting thing that we do today in memory of Bob Hope.

Like many of the other 16 million immigrants who passed through Ellis Island, Bob Hope arrived in America with little. Bob Hope described himself upon arrival as "a 4-year-old boy in knickers who had no idea of the opportunities that lay ahead." He went on to become a household name in the United States and around the world as well.

After arriving in the United States, the Hope family moved to Ohio, and he later started his career in radio. He moved on to appear in numerous movies and Broadway plays. He is perhaps best known, however, for his unwavering commitment to entertaining our Nation's military overseas. Who can ever forget all the various Bob Hope shows at Christmas and Thanksgiving and all throughout the year entertaining our troops in harm's way?

For nearly six decades, often during holidays, from World War II all the way through the Persian Gulf War, Bob Hope traveled the globe, bringing a little bit of America to U.S. troops during times of war and peace. Troops abroad even called him "G.I. Bob," and in 1997 Congress even named him as an honorary veteran for all the work he did with veterans serving overseas.

Bob Hope has been honored in many ways for his work. In fact, the family tells us he has been honored with over 1,500 awards. Some notable awards include several Academy Awards, obviously; a Congressional Gold Medal in 1962; an Emmy; and a Golden Globe.

Despite all the awards Bob Hope received, he had a special place in his heart for Ellis Island, and in 1990 when the Ellis Island Restoration Commission suggested naming the third floor library of the museum in his honor, he stated that it would be "one of the single most important highpoints in my career."

Sadly, Bob Hope passed away in 2003 at the age of 100 and did not see this project finished. So the Bob Hope Memorial Library will serve as a daily reminder to Ellis Island's visitors of Bob Hope's great contributions to the American people, American culture, and the American dream.

Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from Bob Hope expressing his support of the museum as well as a letter from the Ellis Island Restoration Commission expressing their support for this project which I will include for the RECORD.

In conclusion, I want to just say I know that everyone supports this and I trust this will pass unanimously because, after all, this is Bob Hope.

MAY 3, 1991.

Mr. PHILIP LAX, President,
Mr. NORMAN LISS, Chairman of Development,
Ellis Island Restoration Commission,
New York, NY 10005.

DEAR PHIL AND NORMAN: As you well know, I am very honored to be part of the Family Heritage Center at Ellis Island.

However, with my trip to Saudi Arabia at Christmas, two television specials and a hectic schedule, I have not been able to fully express my enthusiasm for the project. Enthusiasm, by the way, which is greater than ever.

Is it possible that I can meet with you and Ann Belkov of Ellis Island along with Alan Prigge and his associate Friedman to discuss details of the campaign and/or a news conference?

I'll be in New York from June 12-16 and hope we can all meet during that period at my Garden City Hotel suite to go over the important details. Or, would you like to set a press conference date hosted by Secretary Lujan?

Once again, the Ellis Island recognition is very special to me and my family and I really appreciate this great honor.

Warm regards,

BOB HOPE.

—
ELLIS ISLAND RESTORATION
COMMISSION,
New York, NY, November 27, 2003.

Mr. WARD GRANT,
North Pass Avenue,
Burbank, CA

DEAR MR. GRANT: The Ellis Island Restoration Commission, together with the National Park Service, are desirous of naming the third floor of the National Museum at Ellis Island in New York Harbor, the Bob Hope Memorial Library in honor of that great American legend.

The ship's manifest, which we have in our possession, reflects that Bob Hope emigrated to America through Ellis Island with his mother and siblings on March 28, 1908, at the age of four. He is probably the most famous

immigrant to come through Ellis Island, of the sixteen million who so emigrated. Forty percent of the current United States population has roots in Ellis Island.

The Museum is owned and administered by the National Park Service on behalf of the Department of the Interior. Ellis Island and the Statue of Liberty, to which it is connected, are the most sought after destinations for tourists visiting New York. The Library contains, among other rooms, the Oral History Room, in which the stories of immigrants who arrived through Ellis Island are recorded and computerized, and the Ellis Island Archives.

As reflected in the letters we have enclosed, Mr. Hope in 1990 and 1991, showed great interest in the Island and reflected sincere appreciation for the honor of having the Library named after him. Unfortunately, at that time, bureaucratic complications did not permit the project to move ahead.

It would be our intention, if the family approves, to seek a bill passed by Congress and have it signed into law by the President. We would not be seeking any funds from the Bob Hope Foundation or any family members, but this would simply be in recognition of the great contributions to America's life, culture and entertainment by Bob Hope.

Ironically, we were in London at the time of Mr. Hope's passing and took the opportunity to visit his childhood home and the Bob Hope Theatre in Eltham.

We were provided your contact information by WOR's Joe Franklin and his producer, Richard Orenstein, in New York, both of whom enthusiastically encouraged this idea.

We look forward to hearing from you after you have communicated with the family and if the response is in the affirmative, make appropriate arrangements for a formal announcement by the Commission, Congressional representatives, National Park Service, as well as family members.

We eagerly await your response.

Sincerely yours,

PHIL LAX,
President.

NORMAN LISS,
Chairman of Development.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 323.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

YUMA CROSSING NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the

bill (H.R. 326) to amend the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area Act of 2000 to adjust the boundary of the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area and to extend the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance under that Act, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 326

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. YUMA CROSSING NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.

Section 3(b) of the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 461 note; Public Law 106-319; 114 Stat. 1281) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) **BOUNDARIES.**—The Heritage Area shall comprise the lands generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area Boundary Adjustment’, numbered 903-80071, and dated October 16, 2005.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) and the gentleman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 326, introduced by Congressman RAÚL GRIJALVA, reduces the boundary of the Yuma Crossing Heritage Area. When the Yuma Crossing Heritage Area was authorized in 2000, the public in Yuma County did not understand the scope of the project and were surprised by the size of the designation. Citizens originally believed that the heritage area would focus mainly around the historic district. Many private property owners were not aware that they were also included in the new designation. Concerns were raised by citizens about the size of the designation and the potential for additional Federal oversight.

Local officials testified that there is now broad public support for the designation with the new reduced boundary.

I urge adoption of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague has already explained the purpose of H.R. 326, which was introduced by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

Representative GRIJALVA is to be commended for his leadership on this

legislation. He has worked closely with the local community and others to determine the most appropriate means to preserve and interpret the history of the area.

Mr. Speaker, we support H.R. 326 and urge its adoption by the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 326, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: “A bill to amend the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area Act of 2000 to adjust the boundary of the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area and for other purposes.”.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL YOUTH COORDINATION ACT

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 856) to establish a Federal Youth Development Council to improve the administration and coordination of Federal programs serving youth, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 856

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Federal Youth Coordination Act”.

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT AND MEMBERSHIP.

(a) **MEMBERS AND TERMS.**—There is established the Federal Youth Development Council (in this Act referred to as the “Council”) composed of members as follows:

(1) The Attorney General, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of National Drug Control Policy, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy, the Director of the U.S.A. Freedom Corps, the Deputy Assistant to the President and Director of the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, and the Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation for National and Community Service, or a designee of each such individual who holds significant decision-making authority, and other Federal officials as directed by the President, to serve for the life of the Council.

(2) Any additional members as the President shall appoint from among representatives of faith-based organizations, community based organizations, child and youth focused foundations, universities, non-profit organizations, youth service providers, State and local government, and youth in dis-

advantaged situations. In making the appointments under this paragraph, the President shall consult with the Speaker of the House of Representatives, who shall take into account the recommendations of the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, and the president pro tempore of the Senate, who shall take into account the recommendations of the Majority Leader and the minority Leader of the Senate. Each member appointed under this paragraph shall serve for 1 term of 2 years.

(b) **CHAIRPERSON.**—The Chairperson of the Council shall be the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(c) **MEETINGS.**—The Council shall meet at the call of the Chairperson, not less frequently than 4 times each year. The first meeting shall be not less than 4 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. DUTIES OF THE COUNCIL.

(a) The duties of the Council shall be—

(1) to ensure communication among agencies administering programs designed to serve youth, especially those in disadvantaged situations;

(2) to assess the needs of youth, especially those in disadvantaged situations, and those who work with youth, and the quantity and quality of Federal programs offering services, supports, and opportunities to help youth in their educational, social, emotional, physical, vocational, and civic development;

(3) to recommend objectives and quantifiable 5-year goals for such programs;

(4) to make recommendations for the allocation of resources in support of such goals and objectives;

(5) to identify areas of overlap or duplication in purpose and operation of programs serving youth and recommend ways to better facilitate coordination and consultation, improve efficiency, and streamline such programs;

(6) to identify target populations of youth who are disproportionately at risk and assist agencies in focusing additional resources on them;

(7) to develop a recommended plan, including common indicators of youth well-being, and assist agencies, at the request of 1 or more agency, in coordinating to achieve such goals and objectives;

(8) to assist Federal agencies, at the request of 1 or more such agency, in collaborating on model programs and demonstration projects focusing on special populations, including youth in foster care, migrant youth, projects to promote parental involvement, and projects that work to involve young people in service programs;

(9) to solicit and document ongoing input and recommendations from—

(A) youth, especially those in disadvantaged situations;

(B) national youth development experts, researchers, parents, faith and community-based organizations, foundations, business leaders, youth service providers, and teachers; and

(C) State and local government agencies, particularly agencies serving children and youth; and

(10) to work with Federal agencies to conduct high-quality research and evaluation, identify and replicate model programs and best practices, provide technical assistance, and coordinate the collection and dissemination of youth services-related data and research.

(b) The Council may provide technical assistance to a State at the request of a State to support State-funded councils for coordinating State youth efforts.

SEC. 4. ASSISTANCE OF STAFF.

(a) **DIRECTOR.**—The Chairperson, in consultation with the Council, shall employ and set the rate of pay for a Director.

(b) **STAFF OF FEDERAL AGENCIES.**—Upon request of the Council, the head of any Federal department or agency may detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of that department or agency to the Council to assist it in carrying out its duties under this Act.

SEC. 5. POWERS OF THE COUNCIL.

(a) **MAILS.**—The Council may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

(b) **ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES.**—Upon the request of the Council, the Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Council, on a reimbursable basis, the administrative support services necessary for the Council to carry out its responsibilities under this Act.

SEC. 6. REPORT.

Not later than 1 year after the Council holds its first meeting, the Council shall transmit to Congress an interim report of its findings, and not later than 2 years after the Council holds its first meeting, the Council shall transmit to Congress a final report including its findings and recommendations. The report shall—

(1) include a comprehensive list of recent research and statistical reporting by various Federal agencies on the overall well-being of youth, including the ratings of the Program Assessment Ratings Tool (PART) of Federal programs serving youth used by the Office of Management and Budget, if applicable;

(2) include the assessment of the needs of youth and those who serve them;

(3) include a summary of the plan called for in section 3(a)(7);

(4) recommend ways to coordinate and improve Federal training and technical assistance, information sharing, and communication among the various programs and agencies serving youth;

(5) include recommendations to better integrate and coordinate policies across agencies at the Federal, State, and local levels, including recommendations for legislation and administrative actions;

(6) include a summary of actions the Council has taken at the request of Federal agencies to facilitate collaboration and coordination on youth serving programs and the results of those collaborations, if available;

(7) include a summary of the action the Council has taken at the request of States to provide technical assistance under section 3(b), if applicable; and

(8) include a summary of the input and recommendations from the groups identified in section 3(a)(9).

SEC. 7. TERMINATION.

The Council shall terminate 60 days after transmitting its final report under section 6.

SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated \$1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 and 2008 to carry out this Act.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. **OSBORNE**) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. **HINOJOSA**) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. **OSBORNE**).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. **OSBORNE**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous information on H.R. 856.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. **OSBORNE**. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 856, the Federal Youth Coordination Act. I am very pleased that the House of Representatives will have the opportunity to consider this important legislation.

I have long advocated for a stronger emphasis at the Federal level on youth development programming because I believe our Nation's future is linked to a healthy, educated, morally sound next generation.

The genesis of this bill is in the report of the White House Task Force on Disadvantaged Youth. Although the final report was issued several years ago, I believe that the task force report and its thoughtful analysis and recommendations should be implemented. This legislation does that. Although the executive branch is charged with implementing youth programs, Congress creates many of these programs and funds them. We need to know that our efforts are producing the best results for our young people.

The White House Task Force on Disadvantaged Youth noted a number of facts about America's young people and the programs that serve them:

First, the National Academy of Sciences estimates that one-quarter of adolescents in this country, almost 10 million teens, are at serious risk of not achieving productive adulthood.

Number two, most young people will grow up just fine without government involvement, but the most vulnerable young people may be missed by programs designed to help them. And, worse, the programs we think will help them the most may not at all. There is a serious lack of rigorous evaluation of Federal youth efforts at the present time.

Number three, a large number of youth-serving programs are targeting many youth subgroups. These services and target populations often overlap, creating unnecessary duplication and multiple programs that are oftentimes not necessary.

Number four, the current Federal response to youth failure is convoluted and complex and is a perfect example of what the GAO has called "mission fragmentation." The GAO recommends that programs with similar goals, target populations, and services be coordinated, consolidated, or streamlined to ensure that goals are consistent.

The White House Task Force identified a number of goals and changes that would help to better coordinate the hundreds of programs across 12 Federal departments that serve youth. The three largest youth-serving agencies are the Department of Health and Human Services, Justice, and Education. To support these efforts, in February of this year, I, along with my colleagues, Mr. **HOEKSTRA**, Mr. **FORD**,

and Mr. **PAYNE**, introduced H.R. 856, the Federal Youth Coordination Act, which was crafted to help implement many of the recommendations of the White House Task Force on Disadvantaged Youth.

The Federal Youth Coordination Act creates the Federal Youth Development Council to evaluate, coordinate, and improve Federal youth-serving programs and hold Federal agencies accountable for achieving results. The purpose of this bipartisan legislation is to maximize the return on Federal investment in young people, not to eliminate programs that work.

America's young people deserve high-quality, effective, and meaningful youth development programs. Our Nation's taxpayers deserve their tax dollars to be spent on high-quality, effective, and meaningful youth development programs as well.

Among the Council's duties will be: to ensure communication among agencies administering programs designed to serve youth. Many of these programs are not allowed by statute to even communicate with each other, and this is a mistake.

To recommend objectives and quantifiable 5-year goals for Federal youth programs. Many of these programs do not have any measurable quantifiable goals at all.

To make recommendations as to how to better facilitate coordination and consultation.

To improve efficiency in programs, identify target populations of youth who are disproportionately at risk and assist agencies in focusing additional resources on them.

To assist agencies in coordinating and collaborating on youth programs.

And to conduct research and evaluation programs, solicit input and recommendations from outside groups.

In addition, the Council may provide technical assistance to a State at the request of a State to support State-funded councils for coordinating State youth efforts.

The Council will also be charged with issuing a report to Congress so that Congress and the authorizing and appropriations committees can use the information in future decisions. This additional information will lead to a more cohesive, efficient, and effective Federal youth policy that our young people deserve. Further, while the Council is chaired by the Department of Health and Human Services, its charge is to coordinate across the full range of Federal departments with a focus on the needs of youth, not on the needs of bureaucracy.

This legislation was developed with the assistance of a number of organizations and has been endorsed by over 250 organizations. I want to thank all of these organizations for their grassroots support, which helped propel this legislation. Among these organizations has been the National Collaboration for Youth, Big Brothers Big Sisters, Campfire USA, Volunteers of America,

YMCA of the USA, Forum for Youth Investment, Youth Service America, Volunteers of America, and America's Promise—the Alliance for Youth.

I want to thank all of the cosponsors of the legislation as well as the chairman of the Education and Workforce Committee, JOHN BOEHNER, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Select Education, PAT TIBERI. Their support has been critical.

I would also like to thank the staff who worked on this legislation, particularly Erin Duncan from my staff, Whitney Rhoades of the Education and Workforce Committee, Krisann Pearce and Jo-Marie St. Martin, also of the Education and Workforce Committee, as well as Brady Young of the Legislative Counsel's Office.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this important effort toward creating more cohesive and meaningful positive youth development programs by passing H.R. 856.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1500

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 856, entitled Federal Youth Coordination Act. I would like to commend the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) for bringing this bill forward. I would also like to add that I admire the gentleman's exemplary work in support of our youth from mentoring and outreach programs to this type of effort to coordinate Federal youth programs.

His commitment to young people is genuine, and his leadership is greatly appreciated. His Federal Youth Coordination Act would establish a Federal Youth Development Council consisting of all of the Federal agencies that have youth development programs. With input from the community, this council would be tasked with ensuring communication across Federal agencies serving youth and developing a plan and set of recommendations to improve Federal services to youth.

I think that we can all agree that coordination is sorely needed. Today's population of adolescents and young adults is the largest in our Nation's history. High schools and colleges are seeing record enrollments.

Tragically, the White House Task Force on Disadvantaged Youth reported that one-quarter of our young people are at serious risk of not achieving productive adulthood. We know from numerous reports that nearly one-third of our high school students fail to earn a diploma with their peers. For African American and Hispanic students, the number is even worse with only 50 percent graduating. Furthermore, many of our young people are not leaving high school ready for college or for work.

It is incumbent upon all of us to build communities with the educational opportunities and support system in place to help our youth become

successful adults. Our record number of teenagers must become a record number of high school and college graduates, and a record number of teachers, scientists, doctors, lawyers, and unskilled professionals. We must not allow this generation to produce record numbers for the juvenile justice, runaway, and homeless youth or foster care systems.

Clearly, success will require strong coordination, schools, families, community-based organizations, employers, health providers, and social service agencies all working together. The Federal Government should lead by example, coordinating its own efforts to support our youth, and H.R. 856 is a step in the right direction.

I would note one concern with the legislation as drafted, however. The amended version of the bill requires the council to report using the results from the Office of Management and Budget's program assessment rating tool, often referred to by the acronym PART. This tool is the subject of significant controversy. For example, a recent GAO report highlighted the closed nature of the PART process and its emphasis on short-term budget planning over long-term goal setting.

In fact, the administration has used the PART as a means to eliminate programs that are not viewed as priorities. Some of these programs are critical to youth and young families, such as the Even Start Family Literacy program, TRIO program, and the GEAR UP and Dropout Prevention programs. It would be ironic to have the PART tool used to provide a rationalization for eliminating programs to help youth rather than expanding their reach and effectiveness.

It is my hope that our focus on accountability for programs will remain with the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, our public law that provides for an open public process for developing objective information on the effectiveness and efficiency of Federal programs and spending.

In closing, I would like to encourage my colleagues to support this legislation, H.R. 856, to coordinate our Federal youth programs. May it spark an even greater sustained investment in our young people.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and thank him for his work on bringing this bill to the floor. He and I have talked about the idea that we ought to take all of these programs that the Federal Government has that affect disadvantaged youth and try to bring some coordination to the overall effort.

As many of us know, Congress gets in the business of duplicating programs

coming from different committees and different agencies of the Federal Government. Before we know it, we have a proliferation of programs, many of them not connected to each other in any way, shape, or form.

I think the proposal brought to us by the gentleman from Nebraska creating this coordinating council really will, in fact, help us achieve what we are attempting to achieve by closer coordination of these 30 different programs.

I can go through a lot of different areas, but I can talk about the Workforce Investment Act, for example. A little different example, but I looked up, along with the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON) some 10 years ago, and we found 63 Federal job training and retraining programs scattered across the different agencies of the government that we were able to bring together under one roof to serve those who needed training and retraining. We have one-stop-shop centers now all over the country.

This is a little different example of trying to reorganize how we do what we do, well meaning, well intentioned; but when we have all of these different programs working on their own without the kind of coordination that this council would bring, I do not think we bring as much of an impact to these children who need our help as we could.

I think the goal here is pretty clear from Mr. OSBORNE, myself, and others that this coordinating council would be there to see that these programs are working, that they are working together to help those disadvantaged youth who need help.

I do not think there is any effort here to consolidate programs, but I think the effort here ought to be making sure that they are effective and making sure that they work together for the advantage of these disadvantaged youth who so desperately need our help. I congratulate my colleague from Nebraska for his work and ask my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 856. I commend the gentleman from Nebraska for introducing this legislation, as well as for many of the other creative ideas and thoughts that I have seen and heard him express in the Education Committee.

I also want to commend my colleague from Texas for yielding to me and for the leadership he displays as the ranking member on one of our subcommittees.

I think that coordination, while it does not necessarily appear to be earth-shaking or earth-shattering, is a tremendous concept that is greatly needed. Unfortunately, many of our programs operate in isolation. Unfortunately, there are instances where there is duplication and things oftentimes get missed.

When we can bring together all of these tremendous resources we have at

our disposal so they are coordinated in such a way that the recipients become the beneficiaries of this coordinated approach, then I think it will tremendously aid in the development of our young people. It is a great piece of legislation. It is a great idea. It is a great concept. I simply want to add my voice to those who are in support of it and urge that we support it.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) for his support and comments and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) for his support, as well, and the support of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS). I have enjoyed working with these gentlemen on this project and the staff.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to work with Congressman OSBORNE, and I want to say that I think this piece of legislation is one that is going to be very beneficial.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLE of Oklahoma). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 856, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

RECOGNIZING 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF ENACTMENT OF EDUCATION FOR ALL HANDICAPPED CHILDREN ACT OF 1975

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 288) recognizing the 30th anniversary of the enactment of the Education For All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 and reaffirming support for the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act so that all children with disabilities have access to a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 288

Whereas the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (Public Law 94-142) was signed into law 30 years ago on November 29, 1975, and amended the State grant

program under part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act;

Whereas the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 established the Federal priority of ensuring that all children, regardless of the nature or severity of their disability, have available to them a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment;

Whereas the Education of the Handicapped Act was further amended by the Education of the Handicapped Act Amendments of 1986 (Public Law 99-457) to create a preschool grant program for children with disabilities aged 3 through 5 and an early intervention program for infants and toddlers with disabilities under 3 years of age and their families;

Whereas the Education of the Handicapped Act Amendments of 1990 (Public Law 101-476) renamed the statute as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA);

Whereas IDEA currently serves an estimated 269,000 infants and toddlers, 679,000 preschoolers, and 6,000,000 children aged 6 to 21;

Whereas IDEA has assisted in a dramatic reduction in the number of children with developmental disabilities who must live in State institutions away from their families;

Whereas the number of children with disabilities who complete high school with standard diplomas has grown significantly since the enactment of IDEA;

Whereas the number of children with disabilities who enroll in college as freshmen has more than tripled since the enactment of IDEA;

Whereas IDEA promotes partnerships between parents of children with disabilities and education professionals in the design and implementation of the special education and related services provided to children with disabilities;

Whereas IDEA has raised the Nation's expectations regarding the abilities of children with disabilities by requiring access to the general education curriculum;

Whereas the 2004 reauthorization of IDEA ensures that children with disabilities are guaranteed a quality education based on the high academic standards required under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (Public Law 107-110);

Whereas the 2004 reauthorization strengthens IDEA's focus on the educational results of children with disabilities and better prepares those children for employment or further education beyond high school;

Whereas the 2004 reauthorization further enables special education teachers, related services providers, other educators, and State and local educational agencies to focus on promoting the academic achievement of children with disabilities;

Whereas the 2004 reauthorization maintains the necessary procedural safeguards that guarantee the rights of children with disabilities and their parents while encouraging the mutual resolution of disputes and reducing unnecessary litigation;

Whereas the 2004 reauthorization continues to ensure the provision of a free appropriate public education to students referred to a private school by a public agency and ensures the provision of special education and related services to students placed by their parents in private schools;

Whereas, although the Federal Government has not yet met its commitment to fund IDEA at 40 percent of the average per pupil expenditure, it has increased IDEA funding over the last decade from \$2.3 billion to \$10.6 billion and increased its percentage share of the average per pupil expenditure from 7.8 percent to 18.6 percent;

Whereas the 2004 reauthorization ensures that the vast majority of funds will go di-

rectly to the classroom and provides States and local educational agencies additional flexibility to provide for the costs of educating high need children with disabilities;

Whereas IDEA has supported, through its discretionary programs, three decades of research, demonstration, and personnel preparation in effective practices for educating children with disabilities, enabling teachers, related services providers, and other educators to effectively meet the educational needs of all children;

Whereas Federal and State governments can support effective practices in the classroom to ensure appropriate and effective services for children with disabilities; and

Whereas IDEA has succeeded in marshaling the resources of this Nation to implement the promise of full participation in society for children with disabilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) recognizes the 30th anniversary of the enactment of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (Public Law 94-142);

(2) acknowledges the many and varied contributions of children with disabilities and their parents, teachers, related services providers, and other educators; and

(3) reaffirms its support for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act so that all children with disabilities have access to a free appropriate public education.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 288.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 288, which I introduced with a bipartisan group of my colleagues. The resolution importantly recognizes the 30th anniversary of the enactment of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, what we all know as the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act, or IDEA. Not only does this resolution recognize the act's anniversary but also reaffirms this body's support for IDEA.

For too many years, children with disabilities were denied access to public education. However, with the passage of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act in 1975, the doors of educational opportunity were opened. Today, more than ever, students with disabilities have an opportunity to accomplish their goals.

□ 1515

According to the Department of Education, about 6.6 million students currently participate in these programs across the Nation. Signed into law on November 29, 1975, the Act established

the Federal priority of ensuring that all children, regardless of the nature or severity of their disability, have available to them what has become the tenet of IDEA, a free, appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment.

In 1986 we expanded the program to serve children with disabilities age 3 through 5, and created an early intervention program for infants and toddlers with disabilities under 3 years of age and their families.

The successes over the past 30 years are worth stating. Based on data from the U.S. Department of Education, since enactment there has been a dramatic reduction in the number of children with developmental disabilities who must live in State institutions away from their families.

The number of children with disabilities who complete high school with standard diplomas has grown significantly since the enactment of IDEA. The number of children with disabilities who enroll in college as freshman has more than tripled since the enactment of IDEA. And IDEA has raised the Nation's expectations regarding the abilities of children with disabilities by requiring access to the general education curriculum.

Last December, President Bush signed into law the latest reauthorization of IDEA. The evolution of the Act, its successes and other education reforms played an integral role in the reauthorization. The 2004 reauthorization aligns IDEA with the No Child Left Behind Act by guaranteeing children with disabilities a quality education based on high academic standards. Along these same lines, we strengthened the focus on the educational results of children with disabilities to better prepare these children for employment or an education beyond high school.

I am pleased that we are able to come together to recognize the good that has been done and to recognize the parents, students and educators impacted over the past 30 years. My hope for the future is that we continue to find ways to raise the achievement of students with disabilities and ensure that they have the services necessary to do so.

I ask my colleagues to support my resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to support H.R. 288, recognizing the 30th anniversary of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, now known as the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act, or by the acronym IDEA. I am proud to join our committee chairmen, chairman of the committee of the whole, Mr. BOEHNER, and the chairman of one of the subcommittees, Mr. CASTLE, as well as our ranking members, Mr. MILLER and Ms. WOOLSEY, to commemorate this important occasion.

I remember the hope that was ushered in with the passage of the Edu-

cation for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975. As a member of the Texas State Board of Education at that time, I chaired the Committee on Special Populations which oversaw programs for migrant children, bilingual education programs for limited English proficient children, gifted and talented programs and programs for children with disabilities. In those days, it was a struggle to provide even basic access to schools for children with disabilities.

We have come a long way. IDEA currently serves an estimated 269,000 infants and toddlers, as well as 679,000 preschoolers and 6 million children ages 6 to 21. There has been a dramatic reduction in the number of children with developmental disabilities who must live in State institutions away from their families. The number of children with disabilities who complete high school with standard diplomas has also grown significantly since the enactment of IDEA.

Finally, the number of children with disabilities who enroll in college as freshmen has more than tripled since the enactment of IDEA 30 years ago.

Although we have come a long way, we still have a way to go. The Federal Government's promise to schools across the country was to share 40 percent of the cost of providing free and appropriate public education to children with disabilities. Today, in 2005, we are only halfway there and seem to have lost our momentum.

In 2004, IDEA reauthorization authorized full funding by the year 2011. Unfortunately, the President's fiscal year 2006 budget proposal for IDEA, part B, was \$3.5 billion less than the authorized level for fiscal year 2006. The House fiscal year 2006 bill is about \$3.9 billion less than the authorized level.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if we continue to increase IDEA funding at the same percentage as the increase between fiscal year 2005 and the 2006 House bill, we will never reach full funding.

As we celebrate the 30th anniversary of this landmark education and civil rights act, let us redouble our commitment to keeping our congressional commitment and promise in 2004 to fully fund IDEA.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), chairman of the Education and Workforce Committee.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) who has worked on IDEA issues for a long time; thank him for bringing this resolution to the floor today, he and Ranking Member WOOLSEY from California, who have brought this resolution honoring the 30 years since the passage of the first IDEA bill.

For far too long in our history, we treated people with disabilities as outside of the mainstream of American so-

ciety. The opportunity to serve those children prior to the passage of IDEA in 1975 was often haphazard. Certainly there was not any organization to it, and many times these children were not in any school whatsoever. And I think passage of IDEA clearly has sent a clear signal to all parents of disabled children, all schools, that we believe that all children can learn.

Just last year, we reauthorized the IDEA law. That, along with the work that we did with No Child Left Behind, I think, presents a new paradigm for special needs children. For far too long we judged the accountability for educating those children by how many T's we could cross and how many I's we could dot. Mountains of paperwork, but no focus on the results that we were getting for those children.

Today, under No Child Left Behind and under the new IDEA law, the paradigm has shifted to one of let us measure the results that we are getting for all children, including those with special needs; and I think what we are beginning to see are improved results. Because while they may not learn at the same rate and while they may not attain the same levels, these children can learn just like all other children. So 30 years of good work, I think, is something that we should be proud of; and I appreciate the opportunity to take time and to remember how far we have come over these last 30 years.

In 1975, when Congress passed IDEA, they made a commitment, a commitment that said that we would pay up to 40 percent of the cost of educating special needs children. Over the years, the education community and others believed that the law said that we would spend 40 percent to educate special needs children. But I will remind you what the original law says and what it says today is that we will spend up to 40 percent and try to reach that.

It is really interesting that, from 1975 until the mid-1990s, Congress paid little attention to the commitment that they gave to those parents of special needs children and to educators who were obliged to follow the law, and it really has only been over the last 10 or 12 years that we have made a real commitment to funding the needs of these children.

If you go back to 1995, Congress at that time was spending \$2.3 billion annually for the education of special needs children. Today, that has grown to \$10.6 billion, a 360 percent increase over these last 10 years. While we have not reached the goal of getting up to 40 percent of the cost, we are about halfway there. I think we have made tremendous progress.

In 1995, we were paying about 6 percent of the cost of educating these children. So we have made great strides. Do we need to continue to do more? Yes, we do. And I think you will see another increase in funding this year as the budget process begins to come to a close. I think the commitment for Members on both sides of the aisle is

very strong to continue our commitment to increasing those funds.

Let me, lastly, remark that someone I would have hoped would have been on the floor today is not here. In 1974, there was a new Member of Congress, a member of our committee, happens to be the ranking Democrat on our committee today, GEORGE MILLER. GEORGE MILLER, over these last 30 years that he has been a Member of Congress, probably has exhibited more commitment to this issue and the education of children with special needs than any Member.

I think that while we are pausing to remember the great things that have happened since IDEA became law, we ought to take a moment to thank our colleague, GEORGE MILLER, who, without his commitment, without his dedication to this cause, many Members of Congress may have forgotten.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed listening to the remarks by our chairman of the Education Committee. I, too, am saddened that the ranking member of our committee, GEORGE MILLER from California, and the ranking member of one of the other committees that deals with this issue, LYNN WOOLSEY, was unable to make the hearing so that they could participate and express their own thoughts. But I can say this, that everything that the chairman said is correct, that we have made great strides.

But coming from an area that has a great rural community in Texas that I represent, I have met with many parents who have children who need this type of education. Their children are disabled, and they talk about the frustration that they have. They wish that the State government would invest much more, together with our public schools. Unfortunately, throughout the country, States find themselves lacking the wherewithal and the financial ability to put more money into many of our public schools. So it is up to the Federal Government, who has a \$2.5 trillion budget, to be able to find the money to increase that investment as we promised 30 years ago and to get to that full funding as we promised then, because I see a lot of potential in those disabled children who, but for the money that the Federal Government could invest, they are not getting the best education possible.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with Chairman BOEHNER, with Subcommittee Chairman CASTLE, with Mr. MILLER, who is not here, and certainly with Ms. WOOLSEY and the ranking member, Mr. HINOJOSA, in strong support of H. Con. Res. 288, which recognizes the 30th anniversary of the enactment of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 and reaffirms support for individuals with disabilities education.

This program currently serves 7 million children, and without it many of

those children would live in State institutions, would not have been able to complete high school and would have no possibility of enjoying the quality of life to which now they have the potential to enjoy.

□ 1530

I have always been led to believe that the greatness of society can be measured by how well it treats its old, how well it treats its young, and how well it treats those who have difficulty caring for themselves. I must say that I have been tremendously impressed with the progress that we have made toward the goal of assuring every handicapped child in our country optimal opportunity to experience the educational attainment and personal development that they have the potential to experience.

I agree that we have certainly come a long way and there is still much further to go. I have had the good fortune of being fairly close to the education of individuals with disabilities, and I can tell my colleagues I had one of the greatest experiences of my life last year when I gave a commencement address at the Neil Elementary School.

There were young people there who had difficulty speaking and needed special equipment in order to be able to speak. There were individuals who could not walk and were in wheelchairs or had other kinds of devices that helped them move. But the interesting thing, and, actually, it was one of those days that I actually left Washington to go back to Chicago to participate in this activity. My sister was the principal of that school, and I had promised her that I would be there for the graduation.

But by the time the graduation ended, there was not a dry eye in the auditorium. Because all of the teachers, all of the parents, all of the students, all of the people who had come to be a part had become so emotionally involved in what was taking place; and to see the glee and excitement on the faces and to feel the emotion coming from these young people, many of whom would never have been given any real chance at all of reaching that level of education attainment, as I sat there and saw that, I could not help but say to myself that no matter how difficult funds may be to acquire, no matter how tight the budgets might be, that we have no choice except to find every possible resource that we can to put all of the funding into these special education programs and activities. Because every time we change one life, then it has been worth the whole effort.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, just briefly, first of all, both of the speakers on the other side of the aisle are men with whom I have worked extensively on this program as well as others, and they have the tremendous interests I think of the students, as we heard from

their testimony here today, at heart, and I think everybody over here does as well.

I do get a little frustrated I guess at some of the economic arguments here. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) pointed out that over the last 10 years we have increased the funding for IDEA by 360 percent, from \$2.3 billion to \$10.6 billion, and comparably, before that, the increases had never, ever gotten above 10 percent. We are up to 20 percent now, and we are on a glide path, if you will, to try to get to 40 percent before it is all said and done.

I think it is important to understand that because of the court-ordered aspect and the way IDEA was born, that the States have the responsibility to make up that difference. So, essentially, when we pick up that extra amount of money, we are basically letting the States spend that money on something else, which may or may not be disabilities. Usually it is something else. And we are trying to continue to move that along and give the States fuller funding. But a tremendous effort has been done in a bipartisan way on that in the last 10 years. I just want to make sure that that is recognized.

I appreciate the comments from everybody on both sides of the aisle on this. I think it is an important subject, and I hope that everybody would support it.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to join my Subcommittee Chairman, Mr. CASTLE, and many other Republicans and Democrats, in introducing this resolution to commemorate the upcoming 30th anniversary of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

In 1975, when what we now call IDEA was passed as the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, educating children with disabilities was an afterthought at best.

IDEA marked a critical turning point in the lives of people with disabilities, by ensuring that all children, regardless of their disability, have available to them a free appropriate public education.

IDEA currently serves 269,000 infants and toddlers, 679,000 preschoolers, and 6,000,000 children aged 6 to 21.

It has assisted in a dramatic reduction in the number of children with developmental disabilities who must live in State institutions away from their families.

Under IDEA, the number of students with disabilities who graduate from high school has grown significantly, and the number of students with disabilities who enroll in college has more than tripled.

Unfortunately, as this resolution recognizes, the Federal Government has not met even half of its commitment to fund IDEA at 40 percent of the average per pupil expenditure. Today, 30 years later, we provide States and school districts with only 18.6 percent of that amount.

Four years ago, during conference on the No Child Left Behind Act, we could have included a bipartisan provision that would have fully funded IDEA, but House Republican leaders refused to agree to that.

Today, I believe that the best way for Congress and the President to commemorate

IDEA's 30th anniversary would be to fund IDEA at the levels authorized in the 2004 reauthorization, which passed the House and Senate with overwhelming bipartisan support.

Those levels would fully fund IDEA by 2011.

Unfortunately, less than a year later, the Republican-controlled House has passed an appropriations bill that falls nearly \$4 billion short of the funding promised for this fiscal year.

At the rate of increase proposed by the Republican House for this fiscal year, we would never—never—reach full funding.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting both this resolution and full funding for IDEA, so that the Federal Government finally will keep its promise to all students, their parents, and their teachers.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 288, recognizing the 30th anniversary of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act. I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of this resolution.

First introduced in 1975 as the Education for All Handicapped Children Act and later as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, or IDEA, this legislation has continued to be a vital part of providing equal support for children with disabilities. Before its passage, children with disabilities were either segregated from other students or had little opportunity for education. Today, about 6.1 million children with disabilities are receiving special education and related services.

As a former educator and a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I recognize the importance of continued Federal support of special education. Research shows that when we invest in the education of children with disabilities from birth throughout their school years, our entire society benefits. Giving these children the opportunities they deserve directly impacts their ability to live independently as contributing members of society.

Congress reauthorized IDEA almost a year ago, and it has continued to provide enormous support to children in dire need. However, as this resolution states, we have not yet met our commitment to fund 40 percent of the additional average pupil expenditure. Until we fulfill our responsibility, we are failing our Nation's children. This funding is needed by school districts that must make up the difference of what the Federal Government is not funding.

IDEA is a powerful civil rights law that was intended to provide education to more than one million children who were marginalized because of their disabilities. Today, it does much more. IDEA is based on the premise that children in our society are capable of success, and this law has raised the standards in education for all children. In doing so, it has also produced much improved results, proving that when we dedicate resources and attention to our children they can succeed.

IDEA requires teachers to be qualified and fair in their classrooms. IDEA also protects and supports the parents of children with disabilities. These parents have challenging, full-time jobs in raising their children. However, when given the support that they need, their children succeed. There cannot be a greater reward for a parent than this.

This law focuses on results. It strives to direct funding to where it makes a difference, to give teachers and schools the resources they need to help students. I believe that more funding will produce greater results. While we

have, as a society, made great strides, we can not let these children fall behind. I urge my fellow Representatives to work towards full funding of this act.

We should be proud that we are now providing free and appropriate public education to every child with a disability. This law adds to the basic right of education the rights to fairness, support, and respect. I join my fellow Representatives in celebrating the 30th anniversary of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 288, a resolution commemorating the 30th anniversary of the legislation that led to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, IDEA.

On November 29, 1975, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act was signed into law. Enactment of that legislation was a historic achievement, ensuring for the first time access to education for children with disabilities, regardless of the nature or severity of their disability. Today, IDEA continues to provide for a free appropriate public education for children with disabilities in the least restrictive environment—in other words, it ensures educational opportunities for children with special needs.

The expansion of IDEA to cover preschool aged children through a grant program and to cover infants and toddlers through an early intervention program has enabled the program to reach many more students—currently IDEA serves an estimated 269,000 infants and toddlers, 679,000 preschoolers, and 6,000,000 children aged 6 to 21. Because these services are being delivered near their homes, IDEA has helped to dramatically reduce the number of children with developmental disabilities who must live in State institutions away from their families.

The success of IDEA has been overwhelming. Under IDEA, the number of children with disabilities who receive a high school diploma has increased significantly and the number of children who enroll in college has more than tripled. By promoting partnerships, between parents and educators in the design and implementation of special education and related services for children with disabilities, IDEA helps these children to reach their full potential and prepares those children for employment or further education beyond high school.

As we recognize the 30th anniversary of IDEA today and reaffirm our support for the legislation, I must note that the Federal Government is still falling far short of its commitment to fully fund IDEA at 40 percent of the average per pupil expenditure. We are currently providing funding at only 18.6 percent, less than half of what we promised. While the teachers and students working under the auspices of IDEA have been able to accomplish many great things, we should think about all that is not being done, the students who are not reaching their full potential and the teachers who cannot do all that they want or need to do with their students, because IDEA is not being fully funded.

We must live up to our commitment and fully fund IDEA, so that it can truly live up to its potential and so that students with disabilities can live up to their potential.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLE of Oklahoma). The question is on

the motion offered by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 288.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHILD MEDICATION SAFETY ACT OF 2005

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1790) to protect children and their parents from being coerced into administering a controlled substance or a psychotropic drug in order to attend school, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1790

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Child Medication Safety Act of 2005”.

SEC. 2. REQUIRED POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As a condition of receiving funds under any program or activity administered by the Secretary of Education, not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, each State shall develop and implement policies and procedures prohibiting school personnel from requiring a child to obtain a prescription for substances covered by section 202(c) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 812(c)) as a condition of attending school or receiving services.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed to create a Federal prohibition against teachers and other school personnel consulting or sharing classroom-based observations with parents or guardians regarding a student's academic performance or behavior in the classroom or school, or regarding the need for evaluation for special education or related services under section 612(a)(3) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(3)).

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) CHILD.—The term “child” means any person within the age limits for which the State provides free public education.

(2) STATE.—The term “State” means each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

SEC. 4. GAO STUDY AND REVIEW.

(a) REVIEW.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a review of—

(1) the variation among States in definitions of psychotropic medication as used in regard to State jurisdiction over public education;

(2) the prescription rates of medications used in public schools to treat children diagnosed with attention deficit disorder, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, and other disorders or illnesses;

(3) which medications used to treat such children in public schools are listed under the Controlled Substances Act; and

(4) which medications used to treat such children in public schools are not listed under the Controlled Substances Act, including the properties and effects of any such

medications and whether such medications have been considered for listing under the Controlled Substances Act.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare and submit a report that contains the results of the review under subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1790.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1790, the Child Medication Safety Act. This common sense legislation will prevent school personnel from forcing parents to medicate their children in order to remain in the classroom.

I would first like to thank Chairman BOEHNER and Speaker HASTERT for their support of this legislation and staff members from my office and the Education Committee for their hard work on this bipartisan bill.

In recent decades, a growing number of children have been diagnosed with attention deficit disorder, ADD, or attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, ADHD, and treated with medication such as Ritalin or Adderall. When a licensed medical practitioner properly diagnoses a child as needing these drugs, the administration of the drugs may be beneficial. However, these medications also have the potential for serious harm and abuse, especially for children who do not need the medications.

Unfortunately, in some instances, school personnel freely offer diagnoses for ADD and ADHD disorders and urge parents to obtain drug treatment for their child. Sometimes, officials even attempt to force parents into choosing between medicating their child and allowing that child to remain in the classroom.

This is unconscionable. Parents should never be forced to medicate their child against their will and better judgment in order to ensure their child will receive educational services.

That is why I introduced the Child Medication Safety Act, a straightforward, sensible approach to remedy this growing problem. The Child Medication Safety Act calls on States to establish policies and procedures prohibiting school personnel from forcing parents to place their child on any drug intended to have an altering effect on perception, emotion, or behavior in order to attend school.

The bill before the House today also includes a provision to ensure that parents and teachers are not prohibited from having an open dialogue about any academic or behavior-related needs of their child. Teachers spend a great deal of time with students and observe a wide variety of situations. These men and women have a valuable perspective to offer to parents, and a candid dialogue between teachers and parents should be encouraged, not stifled. The Child Medication Safety Act makes clear that these constructive conversations can still take place.

This bill is not anti-school, anti-teacher, or anti-medication. This bill is pro-children and pro-parent. The Child Medication Safety Act is essential in protecting children and reinforcing parental control.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill that restores power to parents and puts children first.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1790, entitled the Child Medication Safety Act.

Later today, we will be considering a resolution. In fact, we just finished that resolution where we are celebrating the 30th anniversary of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. So it is fitting that we consider this bill to reaffirm parents' rights on this day, and I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) for bringing this legislation forward.

One of the most difficult decisions for parents is choosing the best course of care for a child with mental health needs. Teachers and other school personnel often play a very important role in bringing problems to the attention of parents because children spend the majority of the day in the classroom. They help to identify children's mental health needs and behavioral problems and assist children and their families in overcoming these barriers toward academic achievement.

Mental health professionals often work with teachers and other school personnel to help create classroom environments that best support children's mental health needs. The information that school personnel provide to the health care professionals about a child's behavior in the classroom is critical to an accurate diagnosis of a child's emotional disorder, learning disability, or other disability. However, the decision to medicate a child to treat mental health problems such as attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, better known as ADHD, belongs solely to the parents. It is a matter between the child, his or her parents, and qualified health and mental health care professionals. That is what this suspension bill today is aimed at achieving.

I support this bill because it achieves this goal while especially recognizing the critical role of teachers and other

school personnel in promoting positive child adjustment together with parents.

Mr. Speaker, our intent here today is not to cause school administrators to become overly cautious or to discourage teachers in aiding parents in the identification of children with serious emotional disorders but to ensure that the decision to use medication to treat serious problem behavior remains with the family.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chance to be here to support the bill offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE). An identical bill to this passed the last Congress 425-1.

Now, one would wonder, why do we need to be here doing this? There are children that do, in fact, have behavioral disorders, have mental health issues, other issues, and certainly teachers and school administrators have a role to play in terms of helping bring this to the attention of parents and, in many cases, urging them to seek qualified medical attention.

But what has come to our attention in a number of hearings that we have had on this issue over the last 4 or 5 years are the number of complaints from parents, grandparents and others where their children were going to be denied admission to school or denied services unless their child was put on medication.

As was noted by both of my colleagues earlier, that is a decision that should be left to the parents, and only to the parents. Certainly, school personnel and teachers can play a role in terms of helping the parents understand what is happening in the school, helping the medical professional in terms of what type of behavior is being exhibited, but, at the end of the day, parents of children ought to have the right to make that decision about whether their child should be on some prescription drug.

□ 1545

The bill is very simple, and I think it lays it out very clearly. Last year when we reauthorized IDEA, the special ed law, we put identical language in that law to protect the parents of special needs children. What this does is covers the rest of the children. I think it is a great step in the right direction, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to participate in the discussion and debate on this legislation. I want to urge my colleagues to support and vote for H.R. 1790, the Child Medication Safety Act.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume only to thank my colleague from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) and, of course, the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), for their support on this very important bill and again to encourage all of my colleagues to pass this pro-parent, pro-child bill.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I want to convey my appreciation to my distinguished colleague from Minnesota, Congressman JOHN KLINE, for his deep concern about our Nation's youth. I thank him for offering this legislation, and I also thank the distinguished Chairman of the Education Committee for his work. Let me be clear that I support H.R. 1790.

Mr. Speaker, during my career in elected office, I have worked to raise awareness that mental illnesses are real and they must be dealt with. Patients diagnosed with psychological disorders, like depression, have higher rates of chronic medical illness and use health care services more often. Untreated depression costs employers more than \$51 billion per year in absenteeism and lost productivity, plus even higher medical and pharmaceutical costs. I have seen first-hand that medication can, indeed, be very successful to depression patients, especially when it is accompanied by proper psychotherapy by a trained and licensed professional.

That notwithstanding, I am concerned about some schools coercing parents to medicate their children without medical justification—exactly what this legislation aims to prevent. When I saw child patients as a psychologist, I was once strongly pressured by a school administrator to recommend medication for students. That sort of pressure is unethical, not to mention potentially leading to harm for children.

While I support H.R. 1790, please allow me to raise one concern that we should keep in mind as the bill moves forward. This bill would make Federal education funding to States contingent on their establishing a policy to prohibit school personnel from requiring a child to be medicated in order to attend school. I am concerned that an unintended consequence of this requirement would be that teachers will be less likely to report legitimate mental health illnesses and needs out of a fear of losing Federal funds.

The current language that would call for a GAO study does not address this problem. I believe, instead that the study should focus on schools that actively influence parents to have their children receive controlled substances. I have shared language that provides this focus with the author of the bill, and I know we can work together with our colleagues to adjust the direction of the GAO study.

Ultimately, we should be doing all we can to encourage parents, teachers and health personnel to communicate with each other whenever there are concerns about children. Our job is to support that communication in every way possible. Nothing in this bill should be construed to limit that important relationship.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLE of Oklahoma). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1790, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1832

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KLINE) at 6 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1065, UNITED STATES BOXING COMMISSION ACT

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-295) on the resolution (H. Res. 553) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1065) to establish the United States Boxing Commission to protect the general welfare of boxers and to ensure fairness in the sport of professional boxing, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

NOTIFICATION OF INTENTION TO ENTER INTO AGREEMENT ON TARIFF TREATMENT FOR MULTI-CHIP INTEGRATED CIRCUITS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 109-70)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Consistent with section 2103(a)(1) of the Trade Act of 2002, I am pleased to notify the Congress of my intention to enter into an agreement with the European Union, Japan, the Republic of Korea, and Taiwan on tariff treatment for multi-chip integrated circuits. Multi-chip integrated circuits are semiconductor devices used in computers, cell phones, and other high-technology products.

United States-based companies are the principal suppliers to the world of multi-chip integrated circuits. In 2004, global sales of finished multi-chip integrated circuits were estimated to be \$4.2 billion, and U.S. semiconductor companies account for roughly half of those sales.

The United States, the European Union, the Republic of Korea, and Taiwan will apply zero duties on these products as of an agreed date. The target date for entry into force of the Agreement is January 1, 2006. Japan already applies zero duties on these products and expects to ratify the Agreement formally in 2006. Further, although all major producers of multi-chip integrated circuits will be parties to the Agreement, we will seek to build on this Agreement by joining together to work in the World Trade Organization to increase the number of countries granting duty-free treatment to these products.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, November 14, 2005.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 1564, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 323, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 856, by the yeas and nays.

The first and third electronic votes will be conducted as 15-minute votes. The second vote in this series will be a 5-minute vote.

Proceedings will resume on H.R. 1790 tomorrow.

YAKIMA-TIETON IRRIGATION DISTRICT CONVEYANCE ACT OF 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1564.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1564, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 0, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 586]

YEAS—420

Abercrombie	Bartlett (MD)	Bishop (UT)
Ackerman	Barton (TX)	Blackburn
Aderholt	Bass	Blumenauer
Akin	Bean	Blunt
Alexander	Beauprez	Boehlert
Allen	Becerra	Boehner
Baca	Berkley	Bonilla
Bachus	Berman	Bonner
Baird	Berry	Bono
Baker	Biggert	Boozman
Baldwin	Bilirakis	Boren
Barrett (SC)	Bishop (GA)	Boucher
Barrow	Bishop (NY)	Boustany

Boyd	Garrett (NJ)	Mack	Ruppersberger	Simpson	Udall (CO)	Clay	Hinchey	Miller (MI)
Bradley (NH)	Gerlach	Maloney	Rush	Skelton	Udall (NM)	Cleaver	Hinojosa	Miller (NC)
Brady (PA)	Gibbons	Manzullo	Ryan (OH)	Slaughter	Upton	Hobson	Clyburn	Miller, Gary
Brady (TX)	Gilchrest	Marchant	Ryan (WI)	Smith (NJ)	Van Hollen	Coble	Hoekstra	Miller, George
Brown (OH)	Gillmor	Markey	Ryun (KS)	Smith (TX)	Velázquez	Cole (OK)	Holden	Moore (KS)
Brown (SC)	Gingrey	Marshall	Sabo	Smith (WA)	Visclosky	Conaway	Holt	Moore (WI)
Brown, Corrine	Gohmert	Matheson	Salazar	Snyder	Walden (OR)	Conyers	Honda	Moran (KS)
Brown-Waite,	Gonzalez	Matsui	Sánchez, Linda	Sodrel	Walsh	Cooper	Hooley	Moran (VA)
Ginny	Goode	McCarthy	T.	Solis	Wamp	Costa	Hostettler	Murphy
Burgess	Goodlatte	McCaul (TX)	Sanchez, Loretta	Souder	Wasserman	Costello	Hoyer	Musgrave
Burton (IN)	Gordon	McCollum (MN)	Sanders	Spratt	Schultz	Cramer	Hulshof	Myrick
Butterfield	Graves	McCotter	Saxton	Stearns	Waters	Crenshaw	Hunter	Nadler
Buyer	Green (WI)	McCrery	Schakowsky	Strickland	Watson	Crowley	Hyde	Napolitano
Calvert	Green, Al	McDermott	Schiff	Stupak	Watt	Cubin	Inglis (SC)	Neal (MA)
Camp	Green, Gene	McGovern	Schmidt	Sullivan	Waxman	Cuellar	Inslee	Neugebauer
Cannon	Grijalva	McHenry	Schwartz (PA)	Sweeney	Weiner	Culberson	Israel	Ney
Cantor	Gutknecht	McHugh	Schwarz (MI)	Tacrede	Weldon (FL)	Cummings	Issa	Northup
Capito	Hall	McIntyre	Scott (GA)	Tanner	Weldon (PA)	Davis (AL)	Istook	Norwood
Capps	Harman	McKeon	Scott (VA)	Tauscher	Weller	Davis (CA)	Jackson (IL)	Nunes
Capuano	Harris	McKinney	Sensenbrenner	Taylor (NC)	Westmoreland	Davis (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Nussle
Cardin	Hart	McMorris	Serrano	Terry	Whitfield	Davis (IL)	(TX)	Oberstar
Cardoza	Hastings (FL)	Meehan	Sessions	Thomas	Wickler	Davis (KY)	Jefferson	Obey
Carnahan	Hastings (WA)	Meek (FL)	Shadegg	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (NM)	Davis (TN)	Jindal	Olver
Carson	Hayes	Meeks (NY)	Shaw	Thompson (MS)	Wilson (SC)	Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson (CT)	Ortiz
Carter	Hayworth	Melancon	Shays	Thornberry	Wolf	Davis, Tom	Johnson (IL)	Osborne
Case	Hefley	Menendez	Sherman	Tiahrt	Woolsey	Deal (GA)	Johnson, E. B.	Otter
Castle	Hensarling	Mica	Sherwood	Tiberi	Wu	DeFazio	Johnson, Sam	Owens
Chabot	Herger	Michaud	Shimkus	Tierney	Wynn	DeGette	Jones (NC)	Oxley
Chandler	Herseth	Millender-	Shuster	Turner	Young (AK)	Delahunt	Jones (OH)	Pallone
Chocola	Higgins	McDonald	Simmons		Young (FL)	DeLauro	Kanjorski	Pascarell
Clay	Hinchey	Miller (FL)				DeLay	Kaptur	Pastor
Cleaver	Hinojosa	Miller (MI)	Andrews	Jenkins	Stark	Dent	Keller	Paul
Clyburn	Hobson	Miller (NC)	Boswell	McNulty	Taylor (MS)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kelly	Payne
Coble	Hoekstra	Miller, Gary	Cunningham	Mollohan	Wexler	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kennedy (MN)	Pearce
Cole (OK)	Holden	Miller, George	Granger	Murtha		Dicks	Kennedy (RI)	Pelosi
Conaway	Holt	Moore (KS)	Gutierrez	Reichert		Dingell	Kildee	Pence
Conyers	Honda	Moore (WI)				Doggett	Kilpatrick (MI)	Peterson (MN)
Cooper	Hooley	Moran (KS)				Doolittle	Kind	Peterson (PA)
Costa	Hostettler	Moran (VA)				Doyle	King (IA)	Petri
Costello	Hoyer	Murphy				Drake	King (NY)	Pickering
Cramer	Hulshof	Musgrave				Dreier	Kingston	Pitts
Crenshaw	Hunter	Myrick				Duncan	Kirk	Platts
Crowley	Hyde	Nadler				Edwards	Kline	Poe
Cubin	Inglis (SC)	Napolitano				Ehlers	Knollenberg	Pombo
Cuellar	Inslee	Neal (MA)				Emanuel	Kolbe	Pomeroy
Culberson	Israel	Neugebauer				Emerson	Kucinich	Porter
Cummings	Issa	Ney				Engel	Kuhl (NY)	Price (GA)
Davis (AL)	Istook	Northup				English (PA)	LaHood	Price (NC)
Davis (CA)	Jackson (IL)	Norwood				Eshoo	Langevin	Pryce (OH)
Davis (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Nunes				Etheridge	Lantos	Putnam
Davis (IL)	(TX)	Nussle				Evans	Larsen (WA)	Radanovich
Davis (KY)	Jefferson	Oberstar				Everett	Larson (CT)	Rahall
Davis (TN)	Jindal	Obey				Farr	Latham	Ramstad
Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson (CT)	Olver				Fattah	LaTourette	Rangel
Davis, Tom	Johnson (IL)	Ortiz				Feeney	Leach	Regula
Deal (GA)	Johnson, E. B.	Osborne				Ferguson	Lee	Rehberg
DeFazio	Johnson, Sam	Otter				Filner	Levin	Renzi
DeGette	Jones (NC)	Owens				Fitzpatrick (PA)	Lewis (CA)	Reyes
Delahunt	Jones (OH)	Oxley				Flake	Lewis (GA)	Reynolds
DeLauro	Kanjorski	Pallone				Foley	Lewis (KY)	Rogers (AL)
DeLay	Kaptur	Pascarell				Forbes	Linder	Rogers (KY)
Dent	Keller	Pastor				Ford	Lipinski	Rogers (MI)
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kelly	Paul				Fortenberry	LoBiondo	Rohrabacher
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kennedy (MN)	Payne				Fossella	Lowe	Ros-Lehtinen
Dicks	Kennedy (RI)	Pearce				Fox	Lucas	Ross
Dingell	Kildee	Pelosi				Frank (MA)	Lungren, Daniel	Rothman
Doggett	Kilpatrick (MI)	Pence				Franks (AZ)	E.	Royal-Allard
Doolittle	Kind	Peterson (MN)				Frelinghuysen	Lynch	Royce
Doyle	King (IA)	Peterson (PA)				Gallegly	Mack	Ruppersberger
Drake	King (NY)	Petri				Garrett (NJ)	Maloney	Rush
Dreier	Kingston	Pickering				Gerlach	Manzullo	Ryan (OH)
Duncan	Kirk	Pitts				Gibbons	Marchant	Ryan (WI)
Edwards	Kline	Platts				Gilchrest	Markey	Ryun (KS)
Ehlers	Knollenberg	Poe				Gillmor	Marshall	Sabo
Emanuel	Kolbe	Pombo				Gingrey	Matheson	Salazar
Emerson	Kucinich	Pomeroy				Gohmert	Matsui	Sánchez, Linda
Engel	Kuhl (NY)	Porter				Gonzalez	McCarthy	T.
English (PA)	LaHood	Price (GA)				Goode	McCaul (TX)	Sanchez, Loretta
Eshoo	Langevin	Price (NC)				Goodlatte	McCollum (MN)	Sanders
Etheridge	Lantos	Pryce (OH)				Gordon	McCotter	Saxton
Evans	Larsen (WA)	Putnam				Graves	McCrery	Schakowsky
Everett	Larson (CT)	Radanovich				Green (WI)	McDermott	Schiff
Farr	Latham	Rahall				Green, Al	McGovern	Schmidt
Fattah	LaTourette	Ramstad				Green, Gene	McHenry	Schwartz (PA)
Feeney	Leach	Rangel				Grijalva	McHugh	Schwarz (MI)
Ferguson	Lee	Regula				Gutknecht	McIntyre	Scott (GA)
Filner	Levin	Rehberg				Hall	McKeon	Scott (VA)
Fitzpatrick (PA)	Lewis (CA)	Renzi				Harman	McKinney	Sensenbrenner
Flake	Lewis (GA)	Reyes				Harris	McMorris	Serrano
Foley	Lewis (KY)	Reynolds				Hart	Meehan	Sessions
Forbes	Linder	Rogers (AL)				Hastings (FL)	Meek (FL)	Shadegg
Ford	Lipinski	Rogers (KY)				Hastings (WA)	Meeks (NY)	Shaw
Fortenberry	LoBiondo	Rogers (MI)				Hayes	Melancon	Shays
Fossella	Lofgren, Zoe	Rohrabacher				Hayworth	Menendez	Sherman
Fox	Lowe	Ros-Lehtinen				Hefley	Michaud	Sherwood
Frank (MA)	Lucas	Ross				Hensarling	Millender-	Shimkus
Franks (AZ)	Lungren, Daniel	Rothman				Herger	McDonald	Shuster
Frelinghuysen	E.	Royal-Allard				Herseth	Miller (FL)	Simmons
Gallegly	Lynch	Royce				Higgins		Simpson

NOT VOTING—13

□ 1856

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BOB HOPE MEMORIAL LIBRARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLINE). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 323.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 323, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 419, nays 0, answered “present” 1, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 587]

YEAS—419

Abercrombie	Bilirakis	Brown-Waite,
Ackerman	Bishop (GA)	Ginny
Aderholt	Bishop (NY)	Burgess
Akin	Bishop (UT)	Burton (IN)
Alexander	Blackburn	Butterfield
Allen	Blumenauer	Buyer
Baca	Blunt	Calvert
Bachus	Boehler	Camp
Baird	Boehner	Cannon
Baker	Bonilla	Cantor
Baldwin	Bonner	Capito
Barrett (SC)	Bono	Capps
Barrow	Boozman	Capuano
Bartlett (MD)	Boren	Cardin
Barton (TX)	Boucher	Cardoza
Bass	Boustany	Carnahan
Bean	Boyd	Carson
Beauprez	Bradley (NH)	Carter
Becerra	Brady (PA)	Case
Berkley	Brady (TX)	Castle
Berman	Brown (OH)	Chabot
Berry	Brown (SC)	Chandler
Biggert	Brown, Corrine	Chocola

Skelton Thomas
Slaughter Thompson (CA)
Smith (NJ) Thompson (MS)
Smith (TX) Thornberry
Smith (WA) Tiahrt
Snyder Tiberi
Sodrel Tierney
Solis Towns
Souder Turner
Spratt Udall (CO)
Stearns Udall (NM)
Strickland Upton
Stupak Van Hollen
Sullivan Velázquez
Sweeney Visclosky
Tancred Walden (OR)
Tanner Walsh
Tauscher Wamp
Taylor (NC) Wasserman
Terry Schultz

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Lofgren, Zoe

NOT VOTING—13

Andrews Jenkins Stark
Boswell McNulty Taylor (MS)
Cunningham Mollohan Wexler
Granger Murtha
Gutierrez Reichert

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLINE) (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1905

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL YOUTH COORDINATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 856, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 856, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 353, nays 62, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 588]

YEAS—353

Abercrombie Boehlert Cantor
Ackerman Boehner Capito
Aderholt Bonilla Capps
Alexander Bonner Capuano
Allen Bono Cardoza
Baca Boozman Carnahan
Bachus Boren Carnahan
Baird Boucher Carson
Baker Boustany Case
Baldwin Boyd Castle
Barrow Bradley (NH) Chabot
Barton (TX) Brady (PA) Chandler
Bass Brady (TX) Clay
Bean Brown (OH) Cleaver
Becerra Brown (SC) Clyburn
Berkley Brown, Corrine Cole (OK)
Berman Brown-Waite, Cooper
Berry Ginny Costa
Biggart Burgess Costello
Bilirakis Butterfield Cramer
Bishop (GA) Buyer Crenshaw
Bishop (NY) Calvert Crowley
Blumenauer Camp Cubin
Blunt Cannon Cuellar

Cummings Kilpatrick (MI) Price (NC)
Davis (AL) Kind Pryce (OH)
Davis (CA) King (IA) Putnam
Davis (FL) King (NY) Radanovich
Davis (IL) Kirk Rahall
Davis (TN) Kline Ramstad
Davis, Tom Knollenberg Rangel
Deal (GA) Kolbe Regula
DeFazio Kucinich Rehberg
DeGette Kuhl (NY) Renzi
Delahunt LaHood Reyes
DeLauro Langevin Reynolds
Dent Lantos Rogers (AL)
Diaz-Balart, L. Larsen (WA) Rogers (KY)
Dicks Larson (CT) Rogers (MI)
Dingell Latham Ros-Lehtinen
Doggett LaTourette Ross
Doolittle Leach Rothman
Doyle Lee Roybal-Allard
Dreier Levin Ruppertsberger
Duncan Lewis (CA) Rush
Edwards Lewis (GA) Ryan (OH)
Ehlers Lewis (KY) Sabo
Emanuel Linder Salazar
Emerson Lipinski Sánchez, Linda
Engel LoBiondo T.
English (PA) Lofgren, Zoe Sanchez, Loretta
Eshoo Lowey Sanders
Etheridge Lucas Saxton
Evans Lungren, Daniel Schiff
Everett E. Schmidt
Farr Lynch Schwartz (PA)
Fattah Maloney Schwarz (MI)
Ferguson Markey Scott (GA)
Filner Marshall Scott (VA)
Fitzpatrick (PA) Matheeson Serrano
Foley Matsui Shaw
Forbes McCarthy Shays
Ford McCaul (TX) Sherman
Fortenberry McColm (MN) Sherwood
Fossella McCotter Shimkus
Frank (MA) McCrery Shuster
Frelinghuysen McDermott Simmons
Gallegly McGovern Simpson
Gerlach McHugh Skelton
Gibbons McIntyre Smith (NJ)
Gilchrest McKeon Smith (TX)
Gillmor McKinney Smith (WA)
Gohmert McMorris Snyder
Gonzalez Meehan Solis
Goodlatte Meek (FL) Souder
Gordon Meeks (NY) Spratt
Graves Melancon Strickland
Green, Al Menendez Stupak
Green, Gene Mica Sullivan
Grijalva Michaud Sweeney
Gutknecht Millender Tanner
Hall McDonald Tauscher
Harman Miller (MI) Taylor (NC)
Harris Miller (NC) Terry
Hart Moore (KS) Thomas
Hastings (FL) Moore (WI) Thompson (CA)
Hastings (WA) Moran (KS) Thompson (MS)
Hayes Moran (VA)
Herseht Murphy
Higgins Nadler
Hinchey Napolitano
Hinojosa Neal (MA)
Hobson Ney
Hoekstra Northup
Holden Norwood
Holt Nunes
Honda Nussle
Hooley Oberstar
Hoyer Obey
Hulshof Oliver
Hunter Ortiz
Hyde Osborne
Inslee Otter
Israel Owens
Issa Oxley
Jackson (IL) Pallone
Jackson-Lee (TX) Pascrell
Jefferson Pastor
Johnson (CT) Payne
Johnson (IL) Pearce
Johnson, E. B. Pelosi
Jones (OH) Peterson (MN)
Kanjorski Peterson (PA)
Kaptur Petri
Keller Pickering
Kelly Platts
Kennedy (MN) Pombo
Kennedy (RI) Pomeroy
Kildee Porter
Price (AK) Young (AK)

NAYS—62

Akin Gingrey Myrick
Barrett (SC) Goode Neugebauer
Bartlett (MD) Green (WI) Paul
Beauprez Hayworth Pence
Bishop (UT) Hefley Pitts
Blackburn Hensarling Poe
Burton (IN) Herger Rohrabacher
Chocola Hostettler Royce
Coble Inglis (SC) Ryan (WI)
Conaway Istook Ryan (KS)
Culberson Jindal Sensenbrenner
Davis (KY) Johnson, Sam Sessions
Davis, Jo Ann Jones (NC) Shadegg
DeLay Kingston Sodrel
Diaz-Balart, M. Mack Stearns
Drake Manzullo Tancred
Feeney Marchant Tiahrt
Flake McHenry Westmoreland
Foss Miller (FL) Wilson (SC)
Franks (AZ) Miller, Gary Young (FL)
Garrett (NJ) Musgrave

NOT VOTING—18

Andrews Gutierrez Reichert
Boswell Jenkins Schakowsky
Carter McNulty Slaughter
Conyers Miller, George Stark
Cunningham Mollohan Taylor (MS)
Granger Murtha Wexler

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLINE) (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1922

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I missed three votes on November 15th, 2005. Had I been present I would have voted "yes" on H.R. 1564 (Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District Conveyance Act); "yes" on H.R. 323 (to redesignate the Ellis Island Library on the third floor of the Ellis Island Immigration Museum, located on Ellis Island in New York Harbor, as the "Bob Hope Memorial Library"); and "yes" on H.R. 856 (Federal Youth Coordination Act).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from this chamber today. I would like the RECORD to show that, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 586, 587 and 588.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3385

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove Representative SANDER LEVIN as a cosponsor of H.R. 3385.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PRIVILEGED REPORT ON RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BOEHLERT, from the Committee on Science, submitted an adverse privileged report (Rept. No. 109-296) on the

resolution (H. Res. 515) of inquiry requesting the President of the United States to provide to the House of Representatives certain documents in his possession relating to the anticipated effects of climate change on the coastal regions of the United States, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

MEDICARE

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 40th year of Medicare. Two years ago, the 108th Congress passed significant legislation that filled in a missing link in Medicare. That missing link was the missing part of prescription drugs.

Significant changes in the Medicare program are going to result in more services, more coverage, and more responsiveness from a program that, quite frankly, no longer lived up to what it needed to do, which is taking care of our seniors in a timely fashion, allowing them access to prescription drugs on a timely basis.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of people are complaining that there are too many plans and it is too complex. Two years ago we heard the opposite, that not enough plans would show up, and that it would be a default position that would only be offered to Medicare beneficiaries.

The situation is complex because health care is complex, but these are important decisions. I urge people over this holiday season coming up to sit down with their mothers and fathers, to sit down with the Medicare beneficiaries in their families and help them work through this process. I think we will find this to everyone's betterment.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3058, TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until midnight, November 15, 2005, to file the conference report to accompany H.R. 3058.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ED ROYBAL

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to

honor the life of Ed Roybal, a member of this House of Representatives, and also to honor the work that his daughter, my colleague, LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, does in this House.

Ed Roybal for many of us was a pathmaker. He was the first Mexican American on the City of Los Angeles City Council, and he was the first Mexican American from California to this House of Representatives. He is probably best known for his work in civil rights and his work on behalf of all people in California. Tonight, we honor him. We honor him, because for many of us he was an inspiration, an inspiration that told us that we could be a politician, that we could be a legislator, that we could be a leader from our community.

I hope that this House will remember the great work of that appropriator, Ed Roybal.

ED ROYBAL

(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I too wish to associate my words with our colleagues from California and honor the great legend, Congressman Ed Roybal. I had the privilege of knowing of his work. I worked with his daughter also when she was a member of the assembly. Ed Roybal in the tradition of Hispanic politics really led the way for so many of us by creating an activism and participation that cannot be compared anywhere.

He started NALEO, National Association of Latino Elected Officials, and also was very much an advocate on health care. One of his major comprehensive health care centers is in East Los Angeles, and it stands there as a tribute to the work that he did tirelessly for the people in poverty, for the elderly, for the seniors and helped establish the school of gerontology at USC and UCLA.

He has been a wonderful individual role model for many of us, fighting discrimination. He fought against Dodger Stadium in East L.A. in Chavez Ravine when developers wanted to displace low-income Mexican Americans back in that era.

He is someone who will be strongly remembered by many of us. I know that his daughter serves very proudly representing his district, and I know that legacy will continue on. He is someone who fought for immigrants when it was not popular, was someone who fought for civil rights, for education and for equal treatment and also for AIDS education and awareness.

He was truly a pioneer and someone to this very day whose very history can be repeated here through, I think, the leadership of his daughter as well as other members of the Hispanic Caucus, which he was the first individual to start. He served as our Chair for that congressional caucus that now has been in operation, I would say, for more than 20 years, if not more.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I would just pay tribute to the Roybal family and also to their daughter who serves with us here.

□ 1930

ED ROYBAL

(Mr. GRIJALVA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to add my voice of homage and respect that we all have for Congressman Ed Roybal.

Our entire Nation, and Latinos in particular, owe Congressman Roybal a huge debt of gratitude. We can manifest our gratitude by holding true to the integrity, the values, the fairness that Congressman Roybal represented in this Chamber.

We can also repay Congressman Roybal by insisting that all Americans have an equal voice and demanding truth as a guiding principle in our government.

I would not be here to celebrate the life of Ed Roybal if he had not blazed a path to which all of us aspire to follow in our political lives. Indeed, Congressman Roybal's shoes cannot be filled, but we can all stay on the path.

My sincere respect and pesame to the Roybal family and my thanks to Congressman Roybal for sharing the possibilities and raising our expectations. Congressman Roybal established our Hispanic Caucus as a founder; NALEO, an organization that represents Latino elected officials; but more importantly he broke the stereotypes about Latinos' place in our Nation and in our political life, that we no longer are just observers in this process but empowered participants. And for that all Americans should be grateful. We should honor and celebrate a life well-served, a life well-dedicated and a life well-spent.

U.S. DOES NOT CONDONE TORTURE

(Mr. HUNTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, around the world right now American troops are being disserved by a mistake promulgated by the American and international news media to the effect that American law allows torture. That is the lie that is being propagated by electronic and written news media around the world.

Mr. Speaker, we have the law here. It is title 18, section 2340A; and I want to read it. It says, "Whoever outside the United States commits or attempts to commit torture shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both, and if death results to any person from conduct prohibited by this subsection, shall be punished by death or imprisoned for any term of years or for life."

That law was signed by then President Bill Clinton on September 13, 1994.

The United States does not allow torture. It is against the law to torture people, and if you torture someone to death you may be executed.

CONGRESSMAN EDWARD ROYBAL

(Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, this evening I honor and celebrate the life of former Representative Edward Ross Roybal.

Edward Roybal is a role model and a hero to us all. Congressman Roybal was a founding member of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials, and the Congressional Hispanic Caucus Institute.

Much is owed to him for his foresight and leadership in establishing these organizations. Today, these organizations are among the leading voices for the Latino community.

I quickly want to share a story that I think epitomizes Ed Roybal's life in the House. In 1982, he opposed a comprehensive immigration reform bill that had many bad provisions and many punitive provisions in it. He threatened to offer more than 100 amendments to the bill and demand a recorded vote on each amendment if the bill was brought to the floor.

Fortunately for him and the Latino community, the House leaders backed down from this battle. This also is a clear example of how much respect folks had for this man because he stood up for what was right. The powers that be recognized him for his leadership.

In June of 1984, this bill was brought up again; and this time he offered seven amendments to amend the bill. His actions showed his relentless commitment and passion for immigration and its human impact on the Latino community.

Today, we face a similar challenge defending those seeking a better life. It is my hope that Members will remember his courage and integrity when we debate this matter.

Mother Teresa once said, "I slept and I dreamed that life is all joy. I woke and I saw that life is all service. I served and I saw that service is joy." Ed Roybal serves as a shining example of the profound impact that one person can have on his or her community and country. He is a model for selflessness and eternal optimism, and I wish to honor him this evening.

"Blessed is the leader who seeks the best for those he serves." For over a quarter of a century, the people of California had such a leader in Edward Roybal. As we all know, the name Ed Roybal has become synonymous with leadership and integrity in the local and national political arena. Indeed, Ed Roybal was blessed for selflessly giving his energy and love and for dedicating his life to those most in need. Let us honor and celebrate his life's work in public service.

Through his life, Edward Ross Roybal was a tireless champion of the most vulnerable—

the elderly and sick in the country. That is why in 2001 President Clinton awarded Congressman Roybal the Presidential Citizens Medal for "exemplary deeds of service for our Nation."

Edward Roybal graduated from the University of California Los Angeles and Southwestern University, where he studied law. After working for the California Tuberculosis Association, he served in the U.S. Army during World War II from April 1944 to December 1945.

Edward Roybal was first elected to the House in 1962. Early in his congressional career, he served on various committees where he distinguished himself for his leadership. In 1971, Congressman Roybal was selected to serve on the Appropriations Committee, where he remained for the rest of his tenure in the House. He was a powerful advocate for funding education, civil rights, and health programs. Most notably, he was one of the first Members of Congress to press for HIV/AIDS research funding.

Representative Roybal also served on the Select Committee on Aging, serving as chair from 1985 to 1993. In 1980, he led a campaign for the restoration of funds to programs for the elderly. In 1982, he was successful in maintaining the Meals on Wheels program.

After Congress, former Representative Roybal used his leftover campaign funds to found a non-profit research agency dedicated to improving the quality and effectiveness of health and human services to older persons, now called the Edward R. Roybal Institute for Applied Gerontology at the California State University—Los Angeles campus. Clearly, Roybal was committed to public health issues that affected the most vulnerable. To this end, in 1999 the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) honored Congressman Roybal's support for public health programs by naming its main campus in Atlanta in his honor and awarding him its Champion of Prevention Award.

Congressman Roybal was also a founding member of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, the National Association of Latino Elected Officials, and the Congressional Hispanic Caucus Institute. Much is owed to him for his foresight and leadership in establishing these organizations. Today, these organizations are among the leading voices for the Latino community.

Mother Teresa once said, "I slept and I dreamed that life is all joy. I woke and I saw that life is all service. I served and I saw that service is joy." Ed Roybal serves as a shining example of the profound impact one person can have on his or her community and nation. He is a model for selflessness and eternal optimism. Ed Roybal is a role model and a hero to us all.

EDWARD ROYBAL

(Ms. WATERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay my respects to Edward R. Roybal.

Congressman Roybal was a true leader. He opened the doors for Hispanics and minorities in so many ways. He was the first Hispanic to serve on the City Council for the City of Los Angeles. He should have been the first to serve on the County Board of Supervisors.

He went on to be elected to the Congress of the United States, where he distinguished himself as a courageous defender of minorities, senior citizens, and the poor. As the Chairman of the Select Committee on Aging, he defended Social Security and Medicare, both of which are now under attack. He also worked to expand access to health care and improve long-term care.

He was a gentle man. He was a man of impeccable integrity. He was a man whose face reflected what he really cared about and who he really was. I will never forget those huge eyes and the way he looked at you. You knew you had to handle yourself a certain way in his presence. You had to handle yourself in a proper way. He was a very dignified man.

I shall never forget how I felt each time I was in his presence; and a testament to who he was and what he cared about certainly is reflected here today in his daughter, LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD.

ED ROYBAL

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to rise to honor the life of Ed Roybal, a great Member of this House with whom I had the pleasure of serving for many years when I first came here back during the 1980s. I would have to say that no one fought harder for health care, particularly for senior citizens and Social Security and Medicare, than the great congressman from the State of California, Mr. Roybal.

He had a quiet strength about him and great dignity, and he treated Members with such graciousness. I certainly remember how he treated me when I first came to the House as a new Member. There were only 24 women serving in the House at that time. I think it is fair to say we have come a long way since then, but Ed Roybal is someone who especially was kind to the women and to the new Members, and I shall never forget him for that.

He helped me in my own campaign when I was running for reelection in my district back in the mid-1980s when there was an effort made to distort votes on Social Security and Medicare, and Ed Roybal came to set the record straight.

I would like to extend to his daughter, who I know he is smiling on today as she serves here in this Congress, and to his entire family the greatest sympathy from the people of Ohio who thank him for the efforts toward which he dedicated his life. I know that the senior citizens who continued to receive Social Security and Medicare during the decades of the 1980s and 1990s and now into the 21st century have Ed Roybal to thank for that.

Condolences to the entire Roybal-Allard family on the passing of this great American gentleman and lawmaker.

ED ROYBAL

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, when I came out to speak about another issue that was very important to me, I did not realize that we were doing 1-minutes on our great friend Ed Roybal.

I just wanted to add my voice as a Californian who came to Congress and was subject to Ed Roybal's kindness and goodness and great sense of courtliness and courtesy, that he will be deeply missed. Because the fabric of Ed Roybal is what makes this House run and gives us civility in difficult times. What a wonderful, fine gentleman and what wonderful treatment he accorded all of us in the California delegation, Republican and Democrat.

ED ROYBAL

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues to reflect upon the life and service of Ed Roybal. I had a great privilege in that I served all of the time that he and I served together, from 1981 until his retirement.

I had the opportunity to serve on two of the appropriations subcommittees with Congressman Roybal. First on the Labor Health Subcommittee, on which I now serve with his daughter LUCILLE who does an extraordinary job and of whom I know he is extraordinarily proud. I then served with him as well on the Treasury Postal Subcommittee, a subcommittee that was very important to me in my district because of my Federal employees.

I was a young, new Member. Ed Roybal was a mentor. Ed Roybal was someone who had great experience and wisdom and who taught me much as a Member of the House of Representatives. He taught me about commitment to people and keeping people uppermost in our minds as we considered the policies before the House and before the Appropriations Committee.

I was privileged to work with Ed Roybal. I was privileged to learn from Ed Roybal. I was privileged to know a gentleman, an American, a proud Mexican-American, and an American who made a difference.

LUCILLE, as you sit there and listen to us talk, and you and I have talked before, I know that you are extraordinarily proud to be the daughter of an American who made a difference, of a Mexican-American who made his people proud, of a Californian who represented his State well.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to honor the memory and the record of a

great American, my friend and mentor, Chairman Ed Roybal.

□ 1945

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

REPUBLICAN CREDIBILITY
DROWNING IN SEA OF RED INK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, today House Republicans had the audacity to claim that they are getting tough on spending, that they are restoring fiscal discipline. But I say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, who do you think you are kidding? Do you not think the American public is watching what you have done?

Just this morning, USA Today reported on our Nation's dire fiscal conditions, quoting experts on both sides of the aisle.

For example, the newspaper said: "To hear Comptroller General David Walker tell it, the United States can be likened to Rome before the fall of the empire. Its financial condition is 'worse than advertised.' It has a 'broken business model.' It faces deficits in its budgets, its balance-of-payments, its savings, and its leadership."

The leadership, of course, of this city and this country is a Republican President, a Republican-led Senate, and a Republican-led House.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a proud Member of this body for 25 years. For 17 of those years, a Republican has occupied the White House. I would suggest to my colleagues, there is one person and only one person in America that can stop spending in its tracks, and that is the President of the United States. No single Member of Congress, no single member of the Senate, but a President can say "no" to spending. So when Presidents lament spending, they lament what they have done.

Here is the reality, Mr. Speaker: in every single one of those 17 years, this country has had substantial deficits. Let me repeat that: 17 years of Republican leadership and 17 straight years of deficits.

The Republican budget reconciliation bill would only perpetuate that record of irresponsibility and recklessness. Why? Because the net effect of their reconciliation package would add \$20 billion additional deficits in this country. Five years ago, the Bush administration and this Republican Congress inherited from a Democratic President a 10-year budget surplus of \$5.6 trillion and four consecutive budget surpluses from the Clinton administration.

I call your attention to this chart: budget deficits, fiscal year 1982, the first fiscal year for which Ronald Reagan was responsible, to fiscal year 2006, which is the current year we are budgeting for. Look at that, 17 straight years of Republican deficits, with no exception.

Now the Republicans come to the floor and they say, oh, my goodness, we have had Iraq. We have, but when Ronald Reagan said it was good morning in America, when he said the economy was doing extraordinarily well and that America was back and had an overwhelming reelection based upon that premise, guess what? We had a deficit of \$212 billion. The next year we had a deficit of \$221 billion. So the deficit picture you see on this chart is unblemished straight deficits until Bill Clinton is elected President of the United States.

Then Bill Clinton, as you can see on this chart, introduced an economic plan on this floor, and I will get to that.

President Bush had promised the American people that he would proceed with tax relief without fear of budget deficits, even if the economy softens. You will see he was dead flat wrong. So when you hear these Republicans make representations about what they are going to do, look at the 17 years Ronald Reagan said he was going to balance the budget. He did not do it. George Bush the First said he was going to balance the budget. He did not do it. The present President of the United States said we can adopt his economic program and we would pay off the national debt, we would not spend a nickel of Social Security, and we would not spend a nickel of Medicare. He was wrong, or I might say, he misrepresented politely every one of those points, and has run up deficits of 157, 377, 412, 319 and \$323 billion.

That record is one that ought to be rejected. Democrats have been united in rejecting those proposals. We will continue to take that posture.

At the same time, Republicans have raised the debt limit not once, but twice, not three times—but four times in four years; \$450 billion in 2002, \$984 billion in 2003, \$800 billion in 2004, and \$781 billion this year.

The interest payments on the national debt are now the fastest growing category of spending in our budget.

So today, when Republicans say that they want to restore fiscal discipline, we must respond: You have lost all credibility on this issue.

President Bush has not vetoed one—not one—spending bill.

Republicans rammed a prescription drug bill through this Congress that they insisted would cost \$395 billion. But they suppressed a more accurate estimate, and now that legislation is expected to cost \$1 trillion.

The budget reconciliation bills are the Republican Party's latest charade.

They say that they are cutting spending by some \$54 billion—including cuts of \$12 billion to Medicaid, \$14 billion to student loans, \$1 billion to food stamps and \$5 billion to child support programs.

But they also plan to cut taxes on the wealthiest people in America by \$70 billion.

Anyway you cut it, this Republican majority intends to increase the deficit, not reduce it.

Even Alan Greenspan, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, is sounding the alarm. Recently, he said: "You should not be cutting taxes by borrowing."

Fortunately, not all Republicans are willing to participate in this irresponsible fraud.

Last Thursday, for example, Senator VOINOVICH told the Washington Post: "I do not know how anyone can say with a straight face that when we voted to cut spending last week to help achieve deficit reductions, we can now then turn around two weeks later to provide tax cuts that exceed the reduction in spending. That is beyond me, and I am sure the American people."

So I implore my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: Demonstrate the courage of your convictions.

Put the interests of the American people ahead of the interests of your political party.

Oppose these irresponsible reconciliation bills.

Join Democrats in fighting to restore fiscal discipline to our budget.

RECOGNIZING THE LEADERSHIP OF COACH BILL SNYDER OF KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am here this evening to honor a legend at Kansas State University, its football program coach Bill Snyder. At a press conference earlier today, Coach Snyder announced his retirement as the head coach of the Kansas State Wildcats after 17 seasons. Coach Snyder leaves behind a legacy of success for a football program, a school, and a community that is stronger and better because of his tremendous leadership.

Football is a great American tradition, and this tradition is alive and well in Manhattan, Kansas. This is Wildcat country, where during football season Powercat flags are proudly flown and where Saturdays are spent at Wagner Field cheering K-State to victories.

But times were different when Coach Snyder took over the Kansas State football program in 1988. Sports Illustrated had identified K-State as the worst college football program in the Nation. Undeterred, Coach Snyder took on the challenge, and through hard work and determination performed what has been labeled as the "Miracle in Manhattan."

By 1993, K-State had achieved a victory in the Copper Bowl. During the next 10 seasons, they would advance to bowl games, including the Cotton Bowl, Fiesta Bowl, and a memorable defeat over first-ranked Oklahoma in 2003 to seize the Big 12 Championship.

With 135 victories, Coach Snyder is K-State's all-time winningest football coach. He is credited with orchestrating what many regard to be the

biggest turnaround in college football history. As former Oklahoma and Dallas Cowboy coach Barry Switzer once said, "Bill Snyder isn't the coach of the year, and he isn't the coach of decade. He's the coach of the century."

Coach Snyder's successes on the field are matched by his achievements off the field. He has taught his players the value of a sound work ethic, attention to detail and respect that has helped them succeed during the game as well as in the classroom and in their lives.

Coach Snyder has used his prominence in the hearts of K-State fans to promote causes that have strengthened the Manhattan community and our entire State of Kansas. No one could deny the pride that has risen following K-State University President John Wefald's decision to hire Coach Snyder. The school's growing athletic program, flourishing and succeeding student body, visionary administration and supportive alumni have all contributed to Kansas State University being one of our country's premier institutions of higher education.

On behalf of many grateful Kansans, I thank Coach Snyder for his contributions. It will be hard to imagine K-State football without this legendary coach, but I wish him and his family the very best.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG PROGRAM AND PLAN FINDER COMPLICATED FOR SENIORS

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) since I am next on the list.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

TRIBUTE TO ED ROYBAL

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, first, I missed the earlier discussion of Chairman Ed Roybal, but I had the privilege of serving with him for a number of years on the Transportation Committee, and he was a wonderful inspiration to a young Member of Congress. I was much younger then, and I learned a good deal during his leadership and would say that he provided a tremendous leadership and a legacy for Californians and all Americans in terms of his investment in transportation infrastructure for America. So my condolences to the family.

I rise tonight to discuss the Medicare prescription drug benefit. I went online today to see what seniors would experience. It is fairly extraordinary, mind-boggling, particularly given the fact that a large number of seniors have never experienced the Internet.

Seventy-six percent of seniors have never been online. I have. It was still not easy. Twenty-six percent of people on Medicare have cognitive impairments. Some of my detractors on the other side of the aisle might say I have that, but I do not. Three million have visual impairments. I wear corrective lenses. And 2.3 million reside in nursing homes.

These are all extraordinary complications for an unbelievably, unnecessarily complicated program. Why was it constructed this way? For two reasons: the pharmaceutical industry and the insurance industry, not the 40 million seniors and others who are eligible for Medicare in this country. The bill was designed by the Republicans to reward their very, very generous contributors in the pharmaceutical and insurance industry.

The insurance industry is an industry, of course, which is exempt from antitrust law. It can and does collude to set prices, exclude people and is quite profitable. Then, of course, the pharmaceutical industry is the most consistently profitable industry in the world.

They are both given subsidies through this legislation. We could have done something much simpler, much less expensive. This plan will cost \$1 trillion over 10 years for the American taxpayers in addition to incredible sums for seniors, particularly those who make wrong choices.

In my little survey, 41 plans came up; and in comparing three, it is going to take me all night if I wanted to compare all 41. I keep going back to the screen that only allows three at a time. My annual costs would vary between \$2,457 and \$5,243; and, of course, the pharmaceutical companies can change the drug benefit weekly. Seniors can change the plan once a year, and you know what will happen if they have large claims during the year and they actually get a benefit? They will be disallowed. They will not be allowed to reenroll in that plan by the private insurance sector next year. There is nothing that requires that they be reenrolled if they are willing to pay the premiums to get the benefits.

We could have had the government, like we do with the VA, go out and negotiate the lowest price for prescription drugs for the Nation's 40 million Medicare eligible citizens. That would have saved billions of dollars; but the Republicans said, well, that is unfair, that is anticompetitive. Well, no, actually we are forming a buying group. We are using market power to negotiate lower prices. They say, no, we should give subsidies to the pharmaceutical industry and subsidies to the non-competitive insurance industry. That

is their version of a free market. Of course, again, they are generous campaign contributors so we can understand some of this rhetoric on their side of the aisle.

Nonetheless, an incredibly expensive, confusing plan which gives all of the benefit to the pharmaceutical and insurance industry, puts seniors at risk, puts taxpayers at risk, and we could have done so much better for so much less. It would cost nothing to negotiate those lower prices. The VA gets prices at a 70, 75 percent reduction from list price; but, no, the Republicans had a special provision in this bill.

Medicare, the default provider for anybody who cannot buy into an insurance plan that is red-lined by the insurance industry, and they can do that legally under this bill, they say, oh, we are not selling you a premium; you have got too many drug claims; we are not going to take you. But they can go to Medicare as a default provider, and guess what? Medicare is the only entity in the world, other than uninsured individuals, who will have to pay list price for drugs. Nobody can afford list price for drugs except the superwealthy and, according to Republicans, Medicare. This will bankrupt the program, but that is where the highest risk seniors, the ones that are not desirable to the industry, will get pushed after maybe 1 year of enrollment, if they are lucky enough to get enrolled in the first year.

So huge costs to taxpayers, confusion and risks for seniors, the end of Medicare in the not-too-distant future by bankruptcy, by design, by the Republicans, all to profit the private insurance industry and the pharmaceutical industry.

You should be really, really ashamed of this horrible product.

NATURAL GAS CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to speak about an issue I have spoken about many times: the natural gas crisis that faces this country.

Yes, we just passed an energy bill, but it did little to help our homeowners heat their homes. We have had a 500 percent increase in natural gas prices in the last 5 years. A month ago, when we were still facing the impact of Katrina, we had a 700 percent gas increase when it reached \$14.50 when it had been \$2 just 5 years ago.

These natural gas prices, in my view, threaten homeownership, church ownership, schools, YMCAs, YWCAs, and small businesses.

In my districts, those kinds of organizations are renewing their gas contracts, and they are paying 100 percent more than they paid last year and many times more than they paid a couple of years ago.

□ 2000

Industries like the fertilizer industry are being crushed by these natural gas prices because 70 percent of the cost of producing fertilizer is natural gas. Forty-four percent of our fertilizer companies are now offshore, and our farmers are paying two and three and four times as much for fertilizer as they did just several years ago.

The huge petrochemical industry that is dominated by America will not be for long because there are 20 chemical plants being built in the world and 19 are offshore. Why? Natural gas prices. Petrochemicals use gas not only as a fuel, but they use it as an ingredient for all the chemicals we buy every day. Polymers and plastics involved in everything we market today use natural gas as an ingredient and natural gas as a fuel. Forty to fifty percent of their costs are natural gas.

We have huge reserves in this country of natural gas. We are not poor on natural gas. Congress and Presidents have chosen to lock it up. Our Outer Continental Shelf, that is the first 200 miles offshore, is rich in natural gas.

We have a bill that we introduced today that will open up the Outer Continental Shelf. We increase States' rights from three miles to 20 miles so it will be all out of sight. There has never been a gas production well that has ever in any way soiled a beach. We need to unlock our natural gas supplies.

Canada, Belgium, Great Britain, Norway, Denmark, Sweden, New Zealand, and Australia produce most of their natural gas offshore, right off of their coastlines. They have beautiful beaches. They are not a threat. There has never been a gas production well that has ever in any way caused beach problems.

I urge Members of this body to deal with this natural gas crisis. We have to open up some supply or we are going to lose major industries. A million or more jobs will be gone in the next 2 or 3 years, some of the best blue collar jobs we have left in this country.

We cannot just subsidize people with natural gas prices. We need to bring prices down by increasing supply because we have lots of it. We have lots of it in the Midwest. But on the Outer Continental Shelf on our coastlines, it is right close to our population centers, it is right close to our plants and our manufacturers.

We will not make steel in this country in the years ahead if we continue. We will not make aluminum in this country. We will not produce anything that uses natural gas to melt it, to bend it, to twist it, to treat it because we cannot afford it. Europe pays half as much for natural gas as we do. China, Taiwan, and Japan are big competitors economically and pay a third of what we pay for natural gas. The rest of the world pays less than \$2.

It is time to get our heads out of the sand. It is time to open up our natural gas reserves in this country and pass

House bill 4318, which would open up huge reserves on our shorelines to produce natural gas in this country so we can compete and have jobs for our working people.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO ED ROYBAL

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our former colleague and friend, Congressman Ed Roybal.

Many people who are in Congress now did not have the privilege of serving with him. They serve with his very distinguished daughter, Congresswoman LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, but the legacy lives on. I wish everyone in this Congress could have seen the outpouring of love and support and devotion to Ed Roybal at his magnificent funeral at the Catholic Cathedral in Los Angeles. We know how respected Ed Roybal is in this body. It was wonderful to see the love of the people he was closest to in California. Many of us went there, and we told his many friends and his family and those close to him of the respect in which he was held here.

Mr. Speaker, I knew Ed Roybal very well for many years. I was a big fan of his when he was doing work with the farm workers organizing in California. He was a legend in our State. And then he continued his leadership for our country in the Congress of the United States.

When I was first named to the Appropriations Committee, Ed Roybal was my chairman. We were in the majority at the time. He was my chairman on the Treasury Postal Subcommittee. So, on a daily basis, I saw firsthand his command of the policy, of the issues, the power of his advocacy and his determination to help all Americans.

Ed Roybal had no time for government of the few. He was about the many. When others in Washington turned their backs on seniors, the disadvantaged, and the poor, Ed Roybal was there. He was the first Member of Congress to appropriate funds for HIV/AIDS, and that sounds very remarkable and commendable now. It was very courageous at the time. He then was a leader. He fought the good fight with courage. He had a special grace about him and a dignity and a twinkle in his eye.

In recognition of his leadership on public health, the Campus of the Centers for Disease Control in Atlanta was named in his honor. Ed Roybal probably has more buildings in California named for him than any other politician ever in California. But at the CDC,

at the Centers for Disease Control, they named an entire campus for him, if that gives Members any idea of the respect and the gratitude that they felt for Ed Roybal.

Fiercely proud of his Hispanic roots and deeply patriotic, the two went hand in hand. Ed Roybal loved America. He helped found the Congressional Hispanic Caucus and the Caucus's Institute and embarked on a mission to provide scholarships to needy Latino children and expand opportunities for all Americans.

Through his work as founder emeritus of the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials, he contributed to the advancement of Latino political power first in Southern California and then in the Nation. Hundreds of Latino elected officials have since followed in his footsteps, all knowing that they stand on his shoulders. By his courage and his determination to open the doors to minorities, Latinos have become much more active in politics and all facets of American society. Indeed, in our State of California, we are now a minority majority State, so we see regularly and firsthand the magnificent contribution of the Latino community to our great country, and Ed Roybal was very much a part of facilitating all of that.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, Eddie Roybal loved his country and he loved his family, speaking with pride of them every day that he served here. Tonight we bring the deepest sympathy of this Congress in which he led and served and indeed the sympathy of our entire country to the family he loved, he adored. I hope it is a comfort to Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD's beautiful mother, Lucille, her name is Lucille as well, and his three children, our colleague Lucille, her sister Lillian and Ed, Jr., that so many people mourn their loss and are praying for them at this sad time.

With the life and leadership of Ed Roybal, God truly blessed America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. STEARNS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT IS A FAILURE

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, today marks the first day seniors can enroll in the new Medicare prescription drug benefit.

When the Medicare drug bill passed this House more than 2 years ago, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle touted it as the greatest health care achievement since Medicare's inception. Today, we have a different reality.

The Medicare drug benefit is an absolute failure. The way this thing is designed, one would think that Brownie from FEMA had something to do with it. It is a failure because of its complexity and inability to provide seniors with access to affordable drugs.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have said this benefit would help 42 million Americans who are served by Medicare. But the only people who are really benefiting from this benefit are the pharmaceutical companies who gave \$132 million over 10 years and have walked away with \$139 billion in additional profits from this bill. Insurers who gave well over \$100 million to the Republican Party are awarded with over \$130 billion in additional profits, all paid for by the taxpayers.

This bill was never designed with the customer in mind. This legislation was designed with the pharmaceutical companies and the HMOs and the insurance companies in mind. They could never have designed something this complex if they were thinking of people who were 65 years and older whose 60 cents out of every dollar for their health care goes to prescription drugs. They could never have thought of that when they designed this legislation and this bill.

Aside from the horrible corporate welfare, the complexity is a real shame here. But what is ironic is on this floor where we debated this, all the Republicans talked to us about how this choice was going to be a real win for the seniors. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) said, "We are simply saying let us offer choices to seniors." The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) said, "To qualify for Medicare, you qualify for this program, and you are going to have choice." The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) said, "This Medicare bill offers a prescription drug benefit through competing private health insurance plans, marking the first time the private sector plans and consumer choice would be the principal vehicle for delivering Medicare benefits."

But it is all this choice that is causing the problem. Sometimes simplicity is better than choice, like Part A and Part B in the Medicare plan. Through all this choice, the only thing they have done is confuse seniors and driven up the profits for the pharmaceutical companies and the HMOs. There is no choice here. Mass confusion is what is going on.

The benefit is so complicated and confusing that even beneficiaries who are PhDs say they cannot figure it out. A recent Kaiser Family Foundation poll found that more than six in ten seniors either barely understand the benefit or do not understand it at all.

But just as important are the choices that the Republican Congress did not make. What did they not do? They did not do anything about the price of these drugs. They could have done something with direct negotiations just like Wal-Mart, just like Target, just like private sector companies, just like VA, the Veterans Administration does: negotiate, pool the resources, purchase bulk, just like every company in the private sector does. They refused to allow Medicare to do that. So we in America now are paying top premium dollar for drug and pharmaceutical prices and products that we could negotiate and get better pricing for. Why do we do that? Because of the pharmaceutical companies. And who is left holding the bag? The taxpayers and seniors.

What else does this legislation refuse to do? It does not allow us to actually access products in Canada and Europe and allow competition to bring prices down. For a party dedicated to the principles of a free market, it is not understandable why they decided to choose a closed market, forcing America to pay the highest prices of any country in the world. Again, negotiation or allowing people access to the prices of drugs in Canada and Europe, we could have brought prices down; and, third, they could have allowed generics to get to the market faster. Three market ways: competition, open markets, negotiations. They could have brought the prices down and had a simpler plan, but there is nobody paying the piper for those ideas, and that is why the pharmaceutical companies are walking off with corporate welfare to the tune of \$139 billion in additional profits, all paid for by the taxpayers, all brought to us by a Republican Congress.

The final bill that created the drug benefit left seniors with a limited benefit that failed to reduce the cost of prescription drugs, gave them serious choices that have led to complexity.

Now it is possible that seniors would understand the drug benefit a little better if this administration had distributed information to beneficiaries that was actually correct. But they botched that, too. The administration's own "Medicare & You" handbook included inaccurate information. Once the errors were discovered, CMS directed seniors to Medicare's Web site, even though over 75 percent of seniors have never used the Internet.

Mr. Speaker, the Medicare prescription drug benefit is an absolute failure. It is a failure because it was never designed with the customer in mind.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. OSBORNE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WYNN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HONORING DON DEARMON ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a friend and trusted adviser, Donald McCamie DeArmon, on the occasion of his retirement from a distinguished career of 28 years of public service in the United States House of Representatives.

□ 2015

Don began his service on Capitol Hill following his graduation from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in 1977. During those 28 years, he worked for the Office of House Information Systems and six Members of Congress.

Congressmembers Bill Ketchum, BARBARA MIKULSKI, Les AuCoin, DAVID PRICE, Vic Fazio, and I all had the good fortune to know and work with him.

It was in 1999 that Don brought his wealth of experience and knowledge to my office, serving first as associate staff for appropriations and then as legislative director and currently as acting chief of staff.

Don is a team player who has mentored many junior coworkers. His political sense and institutional knowledge of the House and his familiarity with the legislative process have provided my office with wise counsel.

His many bipartisan and bicameral friendships built over years in the House have been invaluable to my work on the Committee on Appropriations. His knowledge of the numerous funding accounts has been key to my ability to serve my constituents better. In addition to his work on the Committee on Appropriations, Don has also been the lead staff person for my legislative health agenda. Through his stewardship, we have made progress in addressing the health crisis of underaged drinking and in reducing preventable birth defects through en-

hanced education of women on the importance of folic acid.

Don's commitment to public service and his love of politics reached its natural conclusion when he ran for a seat in the U.S. House of Representatives. There is no doubt that during his campaigns Maryland voters were enriched by Don's discussions of the critical issues facing our Nation.

Although his neighbors in Maryland were denied his direct representation, I can attest to the fact that his public service during the past 28 years has enriched their lives and the lives of many in our Nation.

Don is a man who has admirably met the difficult challenge of balancing the demanding world of public service with being an involved, loving father and husband. He and his wife, Ann, a teacher, have raised four successful and politically active children. Belle, 23, is an English major at the University of Maryland, College Park. McCamie, 21, will be graduating in December from the University of Pittsburgh. Alexandra, 17, is a freshman at Wagner College; and John, 13, is an 8th grader at West Frederick Middle School.

To Don and his family, I extend my deep appreciation and heartfelt congratulations on the momentous occasion of his retirement. We will miss him, his hard work, his wealth of knowledge of political history, and his wonderful anecdotes about his childhood in North Carolina, experiences on the Hill and life in Frederick, Maryland.

Mr. Speaker, I join the many friends and colleagues who have had the privilege of working with Don in wishing him happiness and success as he embarks on his new career in the private sector. Don's new work, advocating on behalf of institutions of health, clearly demonstrates his commitment to the true public servant's belief that the people's work is never done. Godspeed, Don DeArmon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

BROKEN PENSION SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, USA Today on the front of the business page has a major story: "Fundamentally broken" pension system in "crying need" of a fix: Even companies that play by the rules face shortfalls." It goes on to say that David Walker, the chief of Congress's nonpartisan Government Accountability Office, describes the

pension system as "fundamentally broken."

Mr. Speaker, workers who dedicate years of service to a company should be able to count on a decent retirement and a measure of economic security. Yet in this time when more and more companies are reducing or dropping their defined benefit pension plans and retiree health coverage, worker earned benefits are often not guaranteed. This Congress must step up with meaningful pension reform to help shore up pension plans and encourage companies to continue providing them.

Unfortunately, a bill authored by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), who chairs the committee here in the House, is not that needed legislation.

It pays lip service to pension reform for workers, but continues to protect big corporate interests and executives at the expense of workers. It is my sincere hope that this Congress will produce legislation that is truly needed by America and by America's workers. Private pension plans are supposed to be one leg of a three-legged stool of retirement security for all American workers, along with Social Security. However, we live in an era when personal savings are virtually nonexistent, and Social Security's future is menaced by the specter of Republican plans to privatize Social Security. Therefore, workers have to try even harder to shore up increasingly fragile private pension plans.

Unfortunately, the Republican leaders in this Congress want to pass legislation which would actually further destabilize and underfund private pension plans. How in the world can they defend that approach?

Doehler-Jarvis, a company in my district, several years ago was the victim of a takeover where they had to cancel retiree health benefits, and they just did it over one weekend. They never even told the workers they were going to do it. When they filed liquidation bankruptcy, they pushed their obligations onto the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, which is going further and further into the red as I speak here this evening.

Though that was not a perfect solution, that was the only one that existed at that time. Recently, we have heard the announcement by Delphi, the largest U.S. automotive manufacturer, that they are going to declare bankruptcy; and that it is the largest filing of bankruptcy ever in the history of the automotive industry. It will have a significant impact on thousands and thousands of workers. And under the terms of their bankruptcy filing, Delphi is attempting to require its employees to take pay cuts as high as 63 percent and benefit cuts of up to 77 percent just, they say, to keep a few of their U.S. plants open.

The current Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation has a several billion dollar shortfall already. How in the world are they going to be able to try to hold things together without that

fund being shored up, whether it is to help Delphi or anyone else. Frankly, this Congress should have legislation passed that would disallow the bankruptcy system to be used by companies to abdicate their pension and health responsibilities.

However, given the recent flood of companies that have experienced pension problems or breakdowns, the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation is no longer as fail-safe as it used to be. It had a \$23 billion deficit last year, and since the time of President Clinton has continued to fall from a position of surplus to greater and greater deficit. The chairman of the committee, Mr. BOEHNER, dubs his plan the Pension Protection Plan; but it does nothing to prevent runaway pension plan terminations, nothing to provide meaningful disclosure and transparency, or ensure fairness to workers, while rewarding corporate executives. And it does nothing to adequately protect the workers pension plans.

Mr. Speaker, true pension reform legislation would repeal special protections for executives where they can receive these so-called golden parachutes while employees suffer deep cuts in their promised benefits. And the bill currently authored here says if an employer does not fund its pension plan above 80 percent, then workers cannot receive any increases in benefits or take a lump sum at retirement. No similar restriction is placed on executives.

And as the amount of guaranteed benefit goes down, for example if the employer does not fund above 60 percent, the workers' plan must be frozen with no new benefits allowed.

Mr. Speaker, America can do better than this. We ought to deep six the Boehner bill and allow the workers of this country to be able to receive the deferred compensation that was part of the contract that they signed when they went to work for America's largest corporations.

[From the USA Today, Nov. 15, 2005]

**"FUNDAMENTALLY BROKEN" PENSION SYSTEM
IN 'CRYING NEED' OF A FIX**
(By Marilyn Adams)

WASHINGTON.—Most surviving American steelmakers long ago abandoned costly pensions plans. But AK Steel still covers most of its 7,500 workers with a plan that pays retirees a monthly benefit based on tenure and past wages—a coveted defined-benefit plan.

AK has never missed a benefit payment to a pensioner or a payment to fund the plan. That's a source of pride for the 105-year-old Middletown, Ohio, company.

Nonetheless, the assets of the AK pension plan fall \$1.3 billion short of meeting estimated future obligations. The plan's long-term survival isn't assured.

Much of the attention in the raging pension-reform debate in Congress and the executive branch focuses on big companies such as United Airlines and other corporate giants that have used Chapter 11 bankruptcy-court reorganization to dump defined-benefit pension plans on the already overburdened government insurer, the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corp. But it's also cases such as AK Steel—a relative corporate good guy that

has seen assets fall short of liabilities even while the company follows the rules—that have reformers fearing a possible financial catastrophe on the scale of the savings-and-loan meltdown 15 years ago.

David Walker, chief of Congress' non-partisan Government Accountability Office, describes the pension system as "fundamentally broken." He's frustrated that policymakers so far have been unable to solve a problem that's been documented over and over.

"There's a crying need," he says.

Business, Congress and the Bush administration agree that the U.S. system of private pensions is badly in need of fixing. What they haven't agreed on is how to fix it. Despite alarming statistics, years of studies and urgent calls for reform from advocates on all sides, Rep. John Boehner, R-Ohio, a sponsor of the pending House bill on pension reform, rates chances of passage by both houses of Congress this year as slim. Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist, R-Tenn., said Monday that the Senate bill might reach that chamber's floor by next week.

If Congress fails to act, "The problem will become much worse," said Bradley Belt, PBGC executive director. "To call upon taxpayers—most of whom don't have defined-benefit pensions—to pay for the benefits of those who do would be fundamentally unfair."

In total, defined-benefit pension plans offered by private employers are underfunded by \$450 billion, up from \$39 billion just five years ago. The PBGC itself has a deficit of at least \$23 billion. PBGC numbers coming out today are expected to paint an even bleaker picture: The high number of failed plans has left it without enough assets to cover future benefits. As more plans fail, the agency's deficit will grow.

In recent years, Huffy bicycles, Big Bear supermarkets, Polaroid, Kaiser Aluminum, Bethlehem Steel, WestPoint Stevens, Archibald Candy and United Airlines have terminated their plans and transferred responsibility for them to the PBGC. What worries PBGC officials now is how many other large companies are out there with ailing plans covering tens of thousands of workers.

The PBGC last year calculated that financially weak companies with a reasonable chance of terminating their pensions are \$96 billion short of covering promised benefits.

GM A CONCERN

The PBGC won't say whether General Motors, whose pension plan is the biggest in U.S. industry, is among them. But the PBGC estimates that if financially troubled GM had to terminate its plan soon, it would be underfunded by \$31 billion, an estimate first reported by The New York Times. Using a different accounting method, Credit Suisse First Boston estimates the underfunding at \$12.3 billion.

GM, whose plan covers 600,000 participants, disputes those figures but declined to provide its own estimate. It is not required by law to do so. "We don't think it's appropriate to view the pension plan on a termination basis," because GM has no plan to end it, said GM spokesman Jerry Dubrowski.

The U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, meanwhile, is investigating how GM reports pension-plan liabilities in its financial statements as part of a broader look into the automaker's accounting.

PBGC director Belt fears the mounting pension crisis could approach the scope of the savings-and-loan debacle that pushed the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corp. into insolvency in 1989 and cost taxpayers \$200 billion.

If the PBGC, which is supported by insurance-premium payments from pension-plan

sponsors, were to sink too deeply into red ink, a giant taxpayer bailout might be the only way to keep millions of pensioners from losing their checks.

Stopgap pension relief for companies expires Dec. 31. Without comprehensive reform legislation this year, temporary rules will take effect that will increase the contributions companies must make to their plans as well as the insurance premiums they must pay the PBGC. U.S. Labor Secretary Elaine Chao says the price of doing nothing about reform will be "very bad" for plan sponsors.

The pension system in Corporate America is in trouble for many reasons, some within the control of Washington policymakers and some not.

Not the least of the problems is Americans' lengthening life spans. Retirees are living longer than ever and will draw pension checks longer than ever. The biggest generation in history, the baby boom, starts hitting 65 in 2011. Making things worse is that many pension plans let workers start drawing benefits after 30 years of work. For many retirees, that means benefits start in their 50s.

Another factor: Pension funds rely on assets that grow through investments in stocks and bonds. For five years, markets have produced lackluster returns.

LOOPHOLES IN THE LAW

But Congress can do nothing about demographics or investment returns. So reformers are focusing on loopholes in the law—and some companies' willingness to exploit them to avoid or reduce payments.

Private pensions are governed by the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, passed in 1974 after the collapse of automaker Studebaker a decade earlier, which left its retirees almost empty-handed.

The law established the PBGC insurance program, which covers benefits up to specific annual dollar limits—up to \$45,600 this year for someone retiring at 65—and requires companies to pay premiums. Over the years, changes have crept into the law designed to make it easier for firms to comply.

Among the issues that reform proposals address:

PBGC premiums. Almost everyone agrees that without higher premiums and stricter funding rules, pension problems will get worse. The Bush administration proposed \$30 per worker per year, up from \$19 now.

Skipped payments. Rules allow employers to skip plan payments by applying excess contributions from an earlier year as an offset to the minimum requirement for a later year—even if the plan is underfunded.

"The combination of rules allows companies to go for years on end without putting any money into their pension plans," says Belt.

US Airways, for example, made no contributions to its pilots' pension plan for years before it was terminated in 2003.

Overpromising. Employers with underfunded plans are allowed under current rules to sign labor contracts that promise union members larger benefits that the companies can't necessarily afford.

Secrecy. Every employer with a troubled plan is required to tell the PBGC each year how underfunded the plan would be if it had to be terminated. But the company is not required to tell the people directly affected: workers and pensioners. The PBGC is not allowed to tell.

Inadequate funding. PBGC's Belt says funding rules today simply don't ensure that pension plans are fully funded.

Most controversial is an administration proposal to penalize companies with poor credit ratings and underfunded plans by accelerating their plan payments. The thinking is that those companies are at higher

risk for pension default and should be required to do more to keep plans afloat.

'SKY IS NOT FALLING'

Boehner, The Ohio congressman, says such tough medicine would "kill the patient" and prompt some employers to drop their plans.

AK Steel, for example, says its credit rating has been below investment grade for years, yet it has never missed a payment.

Business groups such as the National Association of Manufacturers acknowledged pension rules require tightening. But they question the administration's alarming projections and say companies with pension problems don't represent the majority.

"Our message is the pension sky is not falling," says NAM spokesman Darren McKinney. "The problem is not as big as some would have you believe."

He says the PBGC's statistics show only 15% of private defined-benefit plans were funded below 70% in 2002, the latest data available.

What seems to gall reformers most is the recent pattern of big companies using Chapter 11 of the bankruptcy code to jettison the debt of underfunded pension plans, then exit bankruptcy and survive. U.S. Airways did it, and United is in the process. Huff and Big Bear did the same in the bankruptcy court.

Now, reformers fear Delta Air Lines, Northwest Airlines and auto-parts maker Delphi, all of which filed Chapter 11 cases recently, will make the same argument to their bankruptcy-court judges.

"People are using the pension system and bankruptcy code as a business strategy," charges Walker of GAO.

AK STEEL FEELS PENALIZED

AK Steel agrees. It has seen plenty of competitors unload their plans. AK says its pension and retiree medical costs make its steel at least \$40 a ton more costly to produce than some of its competitors'.

"We are penalized because we didn't go bankrupt," says Vice President Alan McCoy.

So, AK has been going to its unions during contract talks, asking them to agree to freeze members' pension plans so benefits don't keep growing and so new employees aren't covered. Three unions, representing 20% of AK's unionized workforce, have agreed.

"They told us they needed that relief to stay competitive and stay out of bankruptcy," says Tim Imes, president of the United Steelworkers union in Ashland, KY, that represents AK workers there. Given pension-plan terminations at Bethlehem Steel, National Steel and elsewhere, the union knew "the monster was real."

AK officials say they still believe in good pensions but can't ignore their competition.

"We are disturbed that the bankruptcy system allows what has happened to happen," says McCoy. "We don't think that's right."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURGESS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HONORING EDWARD R. ROYBAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to recognize and honor and pay

tribute to the extraordinary life of Congressman Edward R. Roybal. Throughout his career, including 30 years in the United States Congress, Congressman Roybal championed the rights of the underprivileged and broke down barriers for social justice.

I would like to express my deepest sympathy to his family and his friends, especially to his devoted daughter, my colleague and friend, Congresswoman LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, and say with the passing of her father, we lost a great man, a man who stood up for his convictions, a man who stood up for what he believed, and one who stood up for those who needed a voice who did not have a voice in our country. He will be deeply missed.

Like many, I feel very blessed to have known Congressman Roybal personally. He lived his life and I always noticed how he did this: by his actions and by his words. He had principles. He had principles that guided each and every one of his actions, and I think all of us should really understand that those principles are absolutely necessary for us to fight for the rights and the well-being of all human beings, especially those who have been shut out of the American Dream.

His life was not only extraordinary; it was an example to follow for generations to come. Each one of us, I believe, has a duty to carry on the legacy of this great man. Our young people must get to know Congressman Roybal, for he made history taking on tough issues when they were not popular. What a role model he was.

Congressman Roybal not only cared about his own congressional district, which he did very deeply, but he also worked very hard to help communities throughout our country. As a member of my predecessor's, Ronald Dellums, staff, I vividly remember Congressman Roybal's unbelievable efforts to help bring a Federal building to downtown Oakland. Congressman Roybal and Congressman Dellums had a deep friendship and mutual respect for each other. As a result of their partnership, we have a beautiful Ronald V. Dellums Federal Building where my congressional office is presently located.

And in the Federal Building, we also have an Edward R. Roybal Auditorium. And each time I walk into this beautiful building, I am reminded of this great man and his magnificent spirit and his love for his country and for our district.

The 9th Congressional District of California, we owe Congressman Roybal a debt of gratitude; and we thank you and his family for really sharing this giant of a human being with us.

I have several personal and professional affiliations with Congressman Roybal. His son, Eddie, headed up a successful legal services center called Centro Legal De La Raza in Oakland, California. This center provides badly needed legal services to families otherwise unable to afford them.

Many years ago after leaving Ron's staff, Congressman Roybal called me

and he said, Barbara, please, you have to do this for me. I really want you to help us raise money for Centro Legal De La Raza.

Of course I was honored to receive this call from Congressman Roybal, and how could I say no. It was such a great honor to be able to work with him and his family to make sure that we raised the money for many years to provide these badly needed services.

His commitment to justice was unparalleled. His ability to use his clout for those without access to the halls of power, not for himself personally, but for all of those shut out, his love for human kind, his great spirit will be with me forever. He was such a gentleman, a kind human spirit. He was a respectful man, and many of us loved him so much.

So tonight, on behalf of the 9th Congressional District of California, we salute a great warrior; we thank him for a job well done. We also thank Congressman Roybal for a life well lived. In his memory, I think we should all rededicated ourselves to Congressman Edward R. Roybal's ideals and his vision for a better world.

Mr. Speaker, my thoughts and prayers are with you and your family, LUCILLE. May God bless you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HUNTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CUMMINGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

RETHINKING THE IRAQ WAR

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, first, I need to say I did not know Congressman Edward Roybal; but if he did nothing more than bring his daughter, LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, into this world, he brought a gift to all of us. I honor him for that.

Mr. Speaker, I was struck by something that I heard the chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee say over the weekend. Now that it is all too clear that the intelligence leading up to the Iraq war was deeply flawed, he was brave enough to say, "I think a

lot of us would really stop and think a minute before we would ever vote for war or take military action." And then he added, "We do not accept this intelligence at face value anymore."

□ 2030

Great. I am glad that the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. ROBERTS, is so cautious and skeptical now, after more than 2,000 soldiers have been killed, after we have poured \$200 billion into this war, after we have squandered America's global credibility and goodwill.

Back when this could have made a difference, the chairman and so many others in this body and the upper Chamber fell in line behind the President, rubberstamping his war with barely a peep of dissent.

Where were the hard questions then? Where was the oversight and the scrutiny back when it could have saved lives and changed the course of history?

The latest line of argument from the White House is essentially this: Sure, we were wrong about Saddam and weapons of mass destruction, but we did the best we could with what we had.

Leaving aside whether they were mistaken about the intelligence or they actively manipulated it, I would like to see the President look a widow or a grieving mother in the eye and use that line.

The other thing they are saying is maybe we were wrong, but so were a lot of other people, including a lot of Democrats, so get off our backs. This attempt at spreading the blame is dishonest, and it is irresponsible. It was not the previous administration, nor was it the President's opponents in last year's election who launched a preemptive war and put American credibility on the line in selling it.

It was not some other Vice President that leaned on analysts at Langley to reach certain conclusions. It was not some other White House that was fixing the intelligence and the facts around the policy, as the Downing Street Memo put it.

There is only one Commander-in-Chief, and the buck must stop with him. Besides, there were plenty of us who were deeply skeptical about the case for war; and for raising our concerns, many of us had our patriotism called into question.

Ambassador Joe Wilson was among those who raised the red flag, and look what they did to him and to his family.

But of course, as the President is now implicitly admitting, we who questioned the intelligence were right. The very fact that they are trying to rewrite the history of the run-up to war is evidence that the war has been a disastrous mistake. If all were going well in Iraq, the President would not be in this defensive posture, casting about for scapegoats.

There is a way to make it right. There is a way to fix the problem. By

ending the war once and for all. It is time for the President not just to admit his mistakes but to correct them. It is time to return Iraq to the Iraqi people and return our troops home to the families that have gone too long without them.

HONORING CONGRESSMAN ED ROYBAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, Congressman Ed Roybal, who recently passed, will be remembered as a true pioneer in the struggle for human and civil rights. He was an advocate his whole life for the poor, disenfranchised and for seniors.

Ed was first elected to the House of Representatives in 1962, at a time when Henry Gonzalez of Texas was the only other Hispanic representative in the House of Representatives. Ed served with distinction in the House of Representatives for 30 years. He quickly earned the respect of his congressional colleagues and, in 1971, was elected to serve on the Appropriations Committee, where he remained for the rest of his career in Congress. He became Chair of the Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee in 1981. There he became a powerful advocate for funding for education, civil rights and health programs. He was one of the first Members of Congress to support HIV/AIDS research funding.

Ed also had an abiding interest in the needs of our elderly and from 1985 to 1989 served as the Chair of the Select Committee on Aging. In 1980, he successfully restored funds to programs for the elderly and in 1982 played an instrumental role in maintaining the Meals on Wheels program.

He was a trailblazer for the rights of not only Hispanics but of all persons, white, black, brown, the young and the elderly, who had been denied an equal opportunity and were looking for a hand up. He always selflessly extended his hand and never lost sight of those in need throughout his distinguished career as a public servant.

I looked to Ed as he served on the Los Angeles City Council and then in Congress as a voice that could be trusted to consistently respond on behalf of those who could not speak for themselves. We saw him as the go-to guy on the City Council.

Ed's strong and dedicated message will never be silenced. He leaves behind a spiritual and an indelible legacy that will live on. God bless him.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF CONGRESSMAN ED ROYBAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentlewoman from California

(Ms. LOFGREN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize the life and work of Congressman Edward Roybal. As Chair of the California Democratic Congressional Delegation, I am proud to recognize the accomplishments of the pioneer of California Hispanic politics.

In his more than 30 years in Congress, from 1963 to 1993, Congressman Roybal opened many doors for immigrants and the less fortunate in this country, but more importantly he also opened many minds. As the first Hispanic to serve in Congress from California since 1879, his leadership was proof that our Nation's greatness rests in its diversity. He gave future generations the power to be involved in the democratic process by sponsoring legislation which funded bilingual education and inspired thousands to follow his noble example and enter into public service.

Californians are proud to call the visionary Congressman Roybal one of our own. But his contribution was not limited to Hispanics or Californians. Congressman Roybal's vision and passion for social justice issues transcended color lines, age groups and district and State boundaries. He worked tirelessly to extend the civil rights and push the Democratic Party to become more attuned to the needs of immigrants and minorities.

In addition to all the legislation he fought for and all the programs he sponsored, Congressman Roybal will also be remembered because of the legion of public servants he inspired. One of those, a man who fought for equal rights for farm workers of California, was a young man in San Jose named Cesar Chavez.

In 1947, Mr. Roybal first ran unsuccessfully for a seat on the Los Angeles City Council. Reacting to his defeat he founded the Los Angeles Community Services Organization, CSO, with a goal of mobilizing L.A.'s Mexican Americans against discrimination in housing, employment and education. The CSO was founded on the idea that people would learn from each other and would craft solutions to mutual problems, and the model caught on and chapters formed throughout California. In San Jose, Cesar Chavez's first experience in politics was registering voters for the San Jose CSO, and the rest is history.

Today, Congressman Roybal's legacy lives on in Congress and in cities across this country. More than 6,000 Hispanic elected officials have followed him into public service. His daughter and our colleague, the distinguished Congresswoman Lucille Roybal-Allard, now represents part of her father's old district in East L.A. Lucille carries on her father's work of fighting for compassion and diversity in our government.

Although he has passed from this earth, Congressman Roybal's passion

for the poor and his vision for a more inclusive America will live on in the law books of this country and in the hearts and minds of those who have been touched by his service to our country.

On behalf of the my California Democratic colleagues and my constituents in San Jose, I am honored to be here this evening to pay tribute to former Congressman Ed Roybal.

We thank his family for supporting his work over many years and for being the source of tremendous pride for him, his wife, Lucille, his three children, Congresswoman Lucille Roybal-Allard, Lillian and Edward. Our thoughts are with you during your grief, and we are honored to be in this institution that was graced by Congressman Roybal.

This evening, we are going to co-manage the time. We have the Chairperson of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, my wonderful colleague, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, who will speak now for 4 minutes; and then we will yield back to the many colleagues who are here this evening who want to remember Ed.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to repeat all the accolades that have been showered upon a former Member of Congress who I had the opportunity to meet but unfortunately never was able to work alongside of him. You have heard how he was a trailblazer and how he cared for all minorities, all people that were the unvoiced of America; that he chose his battles to where he would stand on this floor and advocate relentlessly on behalf of all the poor and all the unjust things that were carried out against the many peoples of the United States.

I can tell you, though, that from listening to the many stories said about this wonderful individual, you are able to put a picture of a human, humble, dedicated, compassionate, loving family man who devoted his life to politics to make life better for all. And as you have heard, Mr. Speaker, he has become the trailblazer of Latino politics in not only California but in the United States; that, because of him, many of us now are able to stand before great bodies and be able to voice the concerns of those who have no voice in these Chambers.

Mr. Speaker, we have great pride; and another accomplishment of this great man is that he and four other individuals, including the father of our seated Member of Congress from San Antonio, Charlie Gonzalez, Henry B. and several others joined together to form the Congressional Hispanic Caucus Institute, which now fosters young Latinos for future leadership of this country. Another great accomplishment.

I could go on, and I probably would be repeating a lot of things, but there are a lot of unsaid accolades that this gentleman, this gentle man was able to transmit to those many people who knew nothing of him but knew of his greatness.

To his daughter, Lucille, my good friend, we are very, very happy she is

here and trust that he is smiling down upon her.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES).

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Tonight is both a sad night, because we are here because of the passing of a great American, Congressman Ed Roybal, but it is also a time to celebrate his life and his accomplishments and his legacy.

I was just spending a few minutes with my good friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD), a great American in her own right, who carries on that great legacy of her dad, and I was telling her how proud she must be here this evening to hear so many people talk about her dad. I know that she misses him, and I know that there is a huge void in her heart as there exists in many Members that worked with Congressman Roybal.

I did not have the privilege of working with him in the House, but I certainly knew him, or at least I felt I knew him. I got to know him even more by virtue of becoming a good friend of his daughter and my colleague, LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD. She always told us about her experiences coming to Washington and working in and around the Capitol with her mom and her dad and about the things that her dad stood for and about the things that he wanted to change and the things that he did change.

□ 2045

She told us about the optimism that some day in this great country and in this, the people's House, there would be many more Latinos and Latinas that would represent communities all around the country. And guess what? Today, that is reality. Today, we have not only Latinos and Latinas here but many other minorities that carry on the work and the legacy of Congressman Roybal.

What a giant he is among all of us. What a giant he is for us to look up to. As a grandfather, I want to be able to tell my grandkids that they should be proud of their heritage because of leaders like Congressman Roybal and the many things that he has left for us.

There is a lot of work left to be done, but certainly many of us are here tonight and many of us are able to be here in these elected positions because of the work that he and a few others did back then when it must have been

much harder than it is today. The challenge may be different. The challenge today may take on a different venue and a different texture, but we are able to do that and to take on that responsibility because we stand on the shoulders of great leaders like Ed Roybal.

So, tonight, it is sad that we are here because we are going to miss him, but it is also a time to celebrate a great American, a great leader, one that leaves a legacy that I feel personally blessed is carried on by his daughter, LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD. May God bless all of the Roybal family, and certainly God has blessed this country because they have walked into this people's House for two generations.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA).

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute and respect to Congressman Roybal, father to LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, who passed away recently. I was very fortunate with many other individuals who attended the funeral, and there was an outpouring of love that came out. It was an outpouring because this is an individual that led by example. This is an individual that really believed in true family values. He set the example by leading by example. A true husband, a father, an individual who cared about his family.

Beyond caring about his family, he accomplished many things along the way. He created hope, he created opportunity, and he paved the way for many of us who are currently serving right now.

I was blessed to know him as a member of San Bernardino Community College district during my period of time; and during that time, I was involved in NALEAO. He was the man that was very instrumental in creating NALEAO. NALEAO now has created an opportunity for 6,000 individuals to be elected. He created hope, he created opportunity, and he created an opportunity to say, "a si se puede," that you can be whatever you want to be.

He was an individual that cared about people. He cared about the poor, the disadvantaged, the seniors. He believed in fighting for what was right. It is not about representing one segment of the community but representing all segments of the community, because he never forgot where his roots came from.

He originally was born in New Mexico, in Albuquerque, like I and many others who have gone out, but he never forgot his roots. He felt it was important for others to be proud of who you are and where you come from and to say, I represent every individual, regardless of where I come from, but be proud of who you are and where you come from. And he did that. He did that for a lot of us.

Because of that, many of us are in positions that we would not be in right now. But it took someone that was willing to stand up and pave the way, not only fighting for civil rights and

education and opportunities for many individuals and being the first elected to many of the positions that we now have. He was a city councilman, the very first one, and then he became a role model, a mentor, a counselor, someone who guided someone. It is not easy when you are the first, because everybody else expects you to fall down. He did not fall down. He set a good example for others to follow.

Mr. Speaker, because he led by example and did positive things. There were many other opportunities for Hispanics like me and others to say, you know what? If Congressman Roybal can be a city councilman, maybe I can become a school board member, a Senator, a United States Congressman like him. He created that. He created those opportunities for us.

Let me tell my colleagues, we are all very proud of his accomplishments, of what he has done not only in creating opportunity but, at the same time, when there were segregated pools, when they did not let Mexican Americans and others utilize the pools, he wanted to make sure that everyone could. Like Rosa Parks, he believed in civil rights, and he believed in standing up for it. He stood up. The price was not easy, but he stood up and fought. Because of that, America is a lot better today. He has paved the way and set an example for all of us to follow.

Let us follow the lead that Congressman Roybal has done and his daughter is now doing here in Congress by doing the same thing here: fighting for civil rights, fighting for education, fighting for health, being a voice for many people who do not have voices. The daughter is leading because the father set the example to say it is important to have people that speak out.

I am glad to have known Congressman Roybal, and I am equally glad to know LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, and sometimes we forget to mention her last name, ALLARD, as well here serving in Congress.

I offer my condolences to the family, his wife, Lucille, his daughters, LUCILLE and Lillian, and his son, Edward, Jr. You truly are a good example that if you follow your dad's steps, he has true values, he truly is a leader, his legacy will live on forever because he truly is a pioneer for all of us. He has paved the way for hope and opportunity for each and every one of us.

Mr. Speaker, life is a lot better, and no one will ever know how those doors have been opened for many individuals throughout the country. I thank him and say God bless him and God bless your mother and God bless you, LUCILLE ROYBAL.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I now would like to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Los Angeles County (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I am honored tonight to stand here to honor a great American. Last month, America lost a visionary lead-

er, and those of us in Congress lost a dear friend with the passing of the late, great Congressman Edward R. Roybal.

Ed Roybal was a forward-thinking, progressive Latino politician long before there was something called the Chicano movement. He was born in February, 1916, in Albuquerque, New Mexico. At the age of 6, he moved with his family to the Boyle Heights neighborhood of Los Angeles. After earning degrees at UCLA and Southwestern University, he joined the Army in 1944 and went off to fight in World War II.

Upon his return to Los Angeles in 1945, Ed worked as the Director of Health Education for the Los Angeles County Tuberculosis and Health Association. In 1949, he became the first Mexican American elected to the Los Angeles City Council in nearly a century, and it would be his springboard to greater accomplishments.

In 1959, he founded the Mexican American Political Association, one of the first organizations formed to improve the social, economic, cultural, and civic advancements of Mexican Americans and all Spanish-speaking Americans through political action. This organization has become a premier leader in our Nation, fighting for the rights of all Americans.

Later, he also formed the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials. He knew the importance of a political system and wanted to ensure Latinos made their voices heard through this process.

In 1963, he again broke down barriers by becoming the first Mexican American elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in the 20th century.

When he took his seat in Congress, Ed Roybal never forgot his roots and those he represented. But not only did he represent Latinos. I saw him as a leader representing all of us. He worked tirelessly to ensure that all people, Latinos and others alike, were fairly represented and that their interests were not diluted during redistricting. Sadly, he often stood alone in these efforts.

Ed Roybal was also a strong advocate for the elderly and the working poor. We have heard how he served as chairman of both the Select Committee on Aging and the Subcommittee on Health and Long Term Care, moving legislation on health care, Social Security, housing, and other human services. What a great man he was.

He was indeed a New Deal Democrat who was known as a legislator's legislator for his ability to craft and pass landmark legislation. In the 1950s, he stood up against the loyalty oath of the McCarthy era. In the 1960s, he became an early congressional critic of the Vietnam war. And throughout his life, he was a strong advocate of workers' rights.

Ed Roybal opened the doors for a new generation of Latino elected officials; and, in my opinion, he opened the doors for all folks, including his great daughter and our friend and colleague,

Representative LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD. She will now carry the torch of her great father. Other Latino leaders, such as Los Angeles Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa, owe a huge debt of gratitude to this unassuming, yet powerful figure in American politics. He was a trailblazer and an icon of the Latino community. We all owe a debt of gratitude to this great distinguished American who saw a wrong and tried to right it.

I called upon Congressman Roybal at a time when I was in the State legislature, and I had an issue in the city of Compton. I did not know the man, but I called on him because he had shown such compassion for those who were the downtrodden. I called on him, and he came to my aid and with such compassion helped me through the turmoils that I had in my district. I will never forget this very compassionate, powerful, unassuming but great man.

In 1976, he co-founded the Congressional Hispanic Caucus along with others and helped to expand Latino representation across this country. Following his leadership and example, Latinos are today represented in Congress in State legislatures, as governors, and in many other leadership positions, and they lead many of our most populous cities. Yes, he paved the way to political power for today's Latino leaders and all Americans who care about fair and representative elections, and we can be grateful for the path that we crossed with this great man. His service to our country will not be forgotten. His stellar leadership will be with us for always.

The condolences of my constituents of the 37th Congressional District of California are extended to the Roybal family. God bless them all.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues.

I think I bring a different perspective to the comments and the remarks regarding the extraordinary life of Congressman Ed Roybal, and that is that I followed in my father's footsteps just as Congresswoman LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD does today, so I think we have shared experiences.

I know that about 4 years ago Lucille and I were interviewed about our experiences as children being raised in a political family and then following in their parent's footsteps. We had so much to share. So I think that some of my remarks I would hope do bring what I consider a very special view.

The first thing is that our fathers started their careers here in this Congress in 1961 and 1962 respectively and, combined, I think served about 67 wonderful, productive, very successful and historical years in so many different ways. But I think we need to go to the very beginning. They both started their political years in the late 1940s, and they both lost their first races. So I think they always would rise to the

challenge, of course, over tremendous adversity in their entire lives. I think both of our fathers were always referred to as "the first," the first Hispanic to be elected to the House of Representatives from California, the first Hispanic to be elected from the State of Texas, and so on.

□ 2100

People forget what that truly signifies. Being the first at anything means that you are surviving in a very hostile environment; and where we find ourselves today, even when we complain about the challenges and the obstacles that are before us, there is no comparison. It pales to the situation in the 1940s, the 1950s, and the 1960s; and there is no doubt, even today, the barriers are there for people of color.

They had to succeed where no one else had ever succeeded before, and they had to maintain and sustain that position, because much more was expected of them, being that representative of a minority. Yet I do not want to restrict Ed Roybal's contributions and define him simply by his ethnicity, because that is not true. It went way beyond that. He understood until there was justice for all, there would be justice for none; and that is what his life was all about. I am hoping that tonight it is a celebration. I think my colleague, Congressman REYES, has aptly pointed that out.

On the personal side, I ventured a guess that my colleague, LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, did not see much of her father after 1962, that he was way over here on the east coast and the family was way over there on the west coast for the most part, and I know that feeling.

There was tremendous sacrifice on the part of the Roybal family. Tonight I know that my colleagues join me in saying thank you to your mother, to your brother, to your sister and to you, for sharing your father, because he gave much more to us than he probably did individually to you as far as the time that was allowed him to spend with the family.

That was a great sacrifice, which then leads you to the eventual question, and one that we all ask ourselves, and that is the careers that we choose, have we made a difference to sacrifice for our families, because there is no doubt that your father could have been very successful at other enterprises that materially and financially would have been much more rewarding, and he would have been right there at home, but he chose to do something for so many others, and that is a very special calling.

Your mother, your brother, your sister, yourself will probably ask but was it worth it, was it worth that sacrifice. It is a resounding "yes." It is a resounding "yes" if you look at all the city halls, if you look at all our State legislatures, if you look at the United States Congress.

If we go back to 1961 and 1962, I think if we had a congressional Spanish Cau-

cus, the total membership would have been two, LUCILLE's father and my father. The legacy lives on. Tangible and living proof of that is that tomorrow morning there will be 27 Members of this House that will come through these doors that are either Hispanic or Portuguese in descent. All Americans, of course, first and foremost, because I think that is what your father's message was. It was then and it is today and his legacy lives tomorrow.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will be brief, because all that I can say has been said and will be said more eloquently by others on this floor. I wanted to be here for this sad and happy occasion as we celebrate the life and mourn the death of a great American and a great Los Angelino.

Ed Roybal was a pioneer. He started the community service organization and formed a partnership of Mexican Americans, the Jewish community, the Asian community and then was the first in the century, in over a century, member of the Los Angeles City Council, then the first Hispanic in over a century to represent our State here in the House of Representatives, where he served for three decades fighting for the rights of minorities, the elderly, and the physically challenged.

He was a founding member, as has been said before, and the first chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus and was a pioneer in fighting for funding for HIV and AIDS. Edward Roybal leaves a legacy, not just all the awards named after him, not just the program at Cal State Los Angeles that he helped found, not just all of the legislation that he influenced in this House.

He leaves a legacy of his children and grandchildren, and our own LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, I know you far better than I know your brother and sister; but if you are any indication, he left quite a legacy. He was an inspiration to your family and an inspiration to all of us.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), who preceded me as Chair of the Democratic delegation.

Mr. FARR. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight realizing what an incredible privilege it is for us to speak in the well of the floor of the House of Representatives and what a privilege it is to grow up in a family that is politically inspired.

I also know what a heart-wrenching loss a parent is. It tears your heart out. I speak tonight because I feel very privileged, having grown up in a political family, like LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD. I remember so much early childhood politics of what was going on in our house and in the State of California. In many ways, Ed Roybal was like another father, because he was in the era that my father was in politics.

He was born the same year as my mother, 1916, Albuquerque, New Mexico. He came to California, worked in the Civilian Conservation Corps, worked for the California Tuberculosis Association, became involved in World War II as a soldier, and then returned to Los Angeles County as director of health education and then got into politics at the same time, as he and my father both ran for city council, my father in Northern California and Ed Roybal in Southern California. They both lost.

Later on he was elected and became the first Hispanic to serve on the city council in more than a century. I remember in 1954, he was the Democratic nominee for lieutenant governor. My father was on that ballot. I remember that ballot. That was when red baiting went up. People just tore people apart.

They both lost in that election. My father went on to become elected to the State senate and Ed Roybal to the United States Congress. When he arrived here in Congress, he was the first Hispanic Californian to serve in Congress since 1879. He was a pioneer for all our great State, and, indeed, the multicultural democracy that California has become.

He served on the Appropriations Committee, and there is where our paths crossed. I am on the Appropriations Committee. I met LUCILLE when she got elected to the California State Assembly in 1986. We served together there. She came to Congress a few months before I did. We have served both on the Appropriations Committee, the only California Democrats on that committee.

I think when we think back about the privilege we had, not only growing up in a family, yes, things were tough, as pointed out by CHARLIE GONZALEZ, there were also privileges, the privileges of debate, the privileges of commitment to public services, the privileges of wanting to make the world a better place. Those were privileges.

I think that the legacy that he left for his own children, LUCILLE serving in the United States Congress, Lillian, who is a constituent of mine in Santa Cruz and a really able professional, doing a lot to deal with discrimination and how to teach tolerance, and their brother, Edward Roybal, Jr., carrying the yoke of his father, obviously, with not only the same name but all of the responsibilities that his father has left for him.

It is a privilege, and it is sad to lose a parent, but what an opportunity to be able to come to the well of the House of Representatives and give this tribute, a tribute that he, Mr. Roybal, has gotten not only from us here tonight, for his life, but during his life, recognized by Presidents, by Senators, by Congressmembers, by members of the State legislature and city council members; and, frankly, I cannot think of a person who we really know was a pioneer in being able to bring an understanding that if you are going to have

a government of by and for the people, it better look like the people.

I am very proud to be in a congressional delegation from California that is the most multicultural delegation in the United States Congress. Your father started that. I am very, very proud to serve with you.

Perhaps one of the nicest titles that your father has been given, which was while he was still alive, back in 2004, the Mexican-American Political Association named him the Latino Legend of the 20th Century.

LUCILLE, we appreciate the great life that your father gave to public service. We love you for serving with us in the United States Congress. Please pass on our best to all of your family, your sister, and your brother and your mother for the service that your father gave to this country. It made us a better America.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to Congressman JOSÉ SERRANO from New York.

(Mr. SERRANO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I come with a photograph that sits in my office for many years. It is a photograph of the day that I was sworn in as chairman of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus. In the picture is the previous chairman, SOLOMON ORTIZ, and at the center is Ed Roybal.

I think it is fitting that he was at the center, because he was always at the center of any change or movement or any small or large or historic moment in our community. The folks that gave me the photograph titled it "Passing of the Torch." At that moment, it was not passing of the torch because I was such a change in the caucus, but because he always welcomed every new Member, and he always felt that every new Member had something new to add.

Today, as I look at this photograph, I realize that we have two major parties and a lot of other parties courting the Latino vote. We have posters and journalists and editorial boards saying how strong we have become and how important we are. Yet I wonder at times what it must have been for Ed Roybal to be a member of the L.A. City Council at that time and to be a Member of Congress at the time that he was, when it was not fashionable to be a Latino Member of Congress, when it was indeed a pioneering effort.

What I remember most about him is sitting on the House floor and having him speak to me, and in the cloakroom speak to me, with such dignity and such respect about what was expected of me as a Member of Congress, and how much I had to represent the east coast and the Puerto Rican-American community in everything that we did.

He had a way about him that is mentioned here. He is what we call a class act. He conducted himself in such a way. He spoke in such a way. If you did

not know the history, you were baffled at the fact that this man spoke in a low voice, in a soft voice, and yet he had been a giant in tearing down walls.

I guess what he taught me more than anything else is you do not have to yell and scream and kick and get into a rage to make change. You just had to know what it was that you and your community wanted and go at it. This photograph has been replicated today; and tomorrow, LUCILLE, I will present it to you in the hope that your family takes it not as a moment when I was chairman of the caucus, but rather when the founder of the caucus took time to once again continue the message to yet another generation of Members of Congress and Latino Americans, that this was an important thing to do.

This was the passing of the torch at that moment, but he has been passing on the torch and will continue to for as long as we are around.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, we have heard many things today about Congressman Edward Roybal, what a giant he was, what a leader he was, how he stood up for people who had too little, how he changed our world. I am mindful all of us who lost a dad know how very hard it is in a very personal way. Leader or no, it is still your dad. I also know that the best way maybe to know a person, to know someone like Congressman Roybal, is to look at his daughter, who is the same kind of tenacious, dignified person who will stand up for those who have nothing and make a difference, as she is making a difference, just as her father did in the Congress for those in need.

□ 2115

I would like to yield to our beloved colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD).

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Roybal family I sincerely thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO), and my colleagues for tonight's special order and for their kind words about my father, former Congressman Edward R. Roybal.

I thank the President and Mrs. Bush for their considerate letter of condolence, the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) for his graciousness in presenting my mother the flag flown over our Nation's Capitol in my father's honor, and Senate Minority Leader HARRY REID for sharing his special memories of my father on the Senate floor.

For their kind and eloquent words during the memorial services in Los Angeles, I thank my colleagues, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Minority Leader, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ), my father's good friend and colleague, and the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

The Roybal family is also extremely grateful to my father's former chiefs of staff and Antonio Villaraigosa, Mayor of Los Angeles, and his staff for providing so much help and support during this difficult time. My family also send a heartfelt thank you to my many colleagues, constituents, and friends who gave their condolences, attended the services and/or sent flowers.

Mr. Speaker, my father Edward R. Roybal loved our country and this House of Representatives where he served proudly for 30 years. During the past weeks we have heard stories of my father's many legislative accomplishments and oftentimes lonely battles on behalf of the sick, the elderly and the disadvantaged. As one of the 13 cardinals of the House Committee on Appropriations, colleagues from both sides of the aisle have related to me stories of his fairness and ability to work in a bipartisan way on behalf of his constituents and our Nation.

We have also heard about his many tributes, including the naming of the Atlanta campus of the Centers for Disease Control in his honor, and the recognition received for his lifelong leadership when he was awarded our Nation's highest civilian honor, the Presidential Citizens Medal.

I would like to end this special order, Mr. Speaker, by talking about Edward Roybal, the father, from the personal experiences of his three children. As many families do in such times of sadness, my brother, sister and I sat and talked about our memories of Dad or "Pop" as we lovingly called him.

We recalled how deeply he loved our mother and his wife of 65 years, Lucille Beserra Roybal. Always by his side, her hard work and devotion was the glue that held our family together and provided the strength and support that helped to make possible our father's many accomplishments, which started when he was only a teenager, successfully leading the fight against discrimination at a local swimming pool and continued when he was a public health educator in the State of California.

We remembered his strong belief in the value and strength of family and how he, with my mother, shaped our values and modeled for us deep personal integrity.

He taught us faith in God, the value of family and friends and the importance of giving back to one's community. And, without a doubt, he taught us the importance of participating in the political process.

My sister Lillian, my brother Ed and I remembered how we never sat down to dinner at a normal hour with just the immediate family but always surrounded by our political family and friends. We remembered how at any time our house could fill with people and another emergency meeting would be convened, for our house was always the gathering place. We remembered triumphant elections, painful defeats, high expectations, and fearful realities.

The fearful realities were particularly vivid during the forties and fifties when we were young children growing up in the Boyle Heights community of Los Angeles. During that time in our city's history, Mexican Americans and other minorities were not welcomed in many parts of our city. Therefore, one can well imagine the reception my father received in 1949 when he was the first Latino to be elected to the Los Angeles City Council in the 20th century. The racial slurs and not-so-quiet whispers directed at him and our family when we attended events and dinners remain vivid in our minds today.

But equally as vivid is the strength and the courage he demonstrated as many in our society tried to humiliate and intimidate him to give up his cause. Giving up was something he would never consider, because he clearly understood and reminded us often that the struggles and the victories were not about him and our family but about creating a foundation of opportunity for future generations of Latinos and other disenfranchised Americans and community.

In the midst of all of the political turmoil, we also remembered that there was laughter and fun, and we always knew we were loved. We remembered family gatherings when Dad played his guitar and sang with our mother. We remembered his love for his sons-in-law, Michael Rose and Edward Allard, and the deep love and pride he had for his grandchildren, Lisa Elliott, Ricardo Olivarez, Michael Rose, Loushana R. Rose and his great grandchildren Emily Rose, Diego, Santiago, and Lourdes Olivarez and Mason Elliott.

The void my father leaves behind will always be filled with these and many more fond memories and values he left with us as part of his legacy. We miss him, and he will always be in our hearts with great love and pride.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Roybal family, I again thank my colleagues for tonight's special order and for sharing their thoughts and special memories of my father, Congressman Edward R. Roybal.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Roybal family I sincerely thank my colleagues for tonight's Special Order and for their kind words about my father former Congressman Edward R. Roybal.

I thank the President and Mrs. Bush for their considerate letter of condolence, Speaker DENNIS HASTERT for his graciousness in presenting my mother the flag flown over our Nation's capitol in my father's honor, and Senate Minority Leader HARRY REID for sharing his special memories about my father on the Senate floor.

For their kind and eloquent words during the memorial services in Los Angeles, I thank Congresswoman NANCY PELOSI, the Minority Leader, Congressman DAVID DREIER, Chairman of the Rules Committee, Congressman SOLOMON ORTIZ, my father's good friend and colleague from Texas, Congressman XAVIER BECERRA, from California Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa of Los Angeles, Supervisor Gloria

Molina of Los Angeles, Judge Harry Pregerson, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, Sheriff Lee Baca of Los Angeles County, Councilman Alex Padilla, President of the Los Angeles City Council, Antonia Hernandez, Dan Maldonado, Evelyn Verdugo-Tabarez, Brenda Sutton-Wills, Ricardo Olivarez, Eloise Sotello, Linda Newton, and Manuel Gonez.

The Roybal family is also extremely grateful to my father's former Chiefs of Staff, Ed Avila, Henry Lozano, Dan Maldonado, Jorge Lambrinos, Harry Pachon and the Mayor of Los Angeles Antonio Villaraigosa and his staff, for providing so much help and support during this difficult time.

My family also sends a heartfelt thank you to my many colleagues, constituents and friends who gave their condolences, attended the services, and/or sent flowers.

Mr. Speaker, my father Edward R. Roybal loved our country and this House of Representatives, where he served proudly for 30 years.

During the past weeks, we have heard stories of my father's many legislative accomplishments and often time's lonely battles on behalf of the sick, the elderly, and the disadvantaged.

As one of the 13 cardinals of the House Appropriations Committee, colleagues from both sides of the aisle have related to me stories of his fairness and ability to work in a bi-partisan way on behalf of his constituents and our Nation.

We have also heard about his many tributes, including the naming of the Atlanta campus of the Centers for Disease Control in his honor.

And, the recognition received for his lifelong leadership when he was awarded our Nation's highest civilian honor: The Presidential Citizens Medal.

I would like to end this Special Order Mr. Speaker, by talking about Edward Roybal, the father, from the personal experiences of his three children.

As many families do in such times of sadness, my brother, sister and I sat and talked about our memories of Dad or Pop as we lovingly called him.

We recalled how deeply he loved our mother and his wife of 65 years, Lucille Beserra Roybal.

Always by his side, her hard work and devotion was the glue that held our family together and provided the strength and support that helped to make possible our father's many accomplishments, which started when he was only a teenager, successfully leading a fight against discrimination at a local swimming pool and continued when he was a public health educator in the state of California.

We remembered his strong belief in the value and strength of family.

And how he, with my mother, shaped our values and modeled for us deep personal integrity.

He taught us faith in God, the value of family and friends, and the importance of giving back to one's community.

And without a doubt, he taught us the importance of participating in the political process.

My sister Lillian, my brother Ed and I, remembered how we never sat down to dinner at a normal hour with just the immediate family, but always surrounded by our political family and friends.

We remembered how at any time our house could fill with people and another emergency meeting would be convened. . . . for our house was always the gathering place.

We remembered triumphant elections, painful defeats, high expectations, and fearful realities.

The fearful realities were particularly vivid during the forties and fifties when we were young children growing up in the Boyle Heights community of Los Angeles.

During that time in our city's history, Mexican Americans and other minorities were not welcomed in many parts of our city.

Therefore, one can well imagine the reception my father received in 1949, when he was the first Latino to be elected to the Los Angeles City Council in the twentieth century.

The racial slurs and not so quiet whispers directed at him and our family when we attended events and dinners remain vivid in our minds even today.

But equally as vivid is the strength and the courage he demonstrated as many in our society tried to humiliate and intimidate him to give up his cause.

Giving up was something he would never consider because he clearly understood, and reminded us often, that the struggles, and even the victories, were not about him and our family, but about creating a foundation of opportunity for future generations of Latinos and other disenfranchised Americans and Communities.

In the midst of all the political turmoil, we also remembered that there was laughter and fun; and we always knew we were loved.

We remembered family gatherings when Dad played his guitar and sang with our mother.

We remembered his love for his son-in-laws Michael Rose and Edward Allard.

And the deep love and pride he had for his grandchildren Lisa Elliott, Ricardo Olivarez, Michael R. Rose, Loushana R. Rose and his great grandchildren Emily Rose, Diego, Santiago, and Lourdes Olivarez and Mason Elliott.

The void my father leaves behind will always be filled with these and many more fond memories and values he left with us as part of his legacy.

We miss him and he will always be in our hearts with great love and pride.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Roybal family, I again thank my colleagues for tonight's Special Order and for sharing their thoughts and special memories of my father, Congressman Edward R. Roybal.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the contributions of an outstanding Californian. We lost a tireless public servant and inspiring colleague when Edward R. Roybal passed away on October 25th. He dedicated his career to a better America for minorities, the poor, and the elderly. This is a sad loss for our delegation, but also a time to reflect upon and remember the aspirations and accomplishments of an outstanding colleague and friend.

Edward Roybal served here for 30 years as the first Hispanic member from California in over 80 years. He was a founding member and the first chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus (CHC). He was a founding member of the National Association of Latino Elected Officials (NALEO) and the Congressional Hispanic Caucus Institute.

Before his election to the House, Ed worked in health education and fought for equal rights in housing, education and employment. Ed brought these passions to the House of Representatives in 1963, and made his mark as a visionary for a more inclusive America. In the years to come, Ed labored to pass legislation to outlaw age discrimination. He worked for numerous benefits and opportunities for those with handicaps. As we accept and embrace the rights of these fellow citizens, Ed was a trailblazer leading the way.

In his work on the Appropriations Committee, Ed led efforts to protect funding for programs for the elderly, including public housing programs for senior citizens, community-based alternatives to nursing homes, and the Meals on Wheels program. Ed also continued to fight for laws that treated all Americans fairly. He voted to pass the Equal Rights Amendment and played a key role in helping to pass legislation that reversed a 1989 Supreme Court decision allowing age-based discrimination in employee benefits. Ed retired following the 1992 elections leaving a thirty-year record of success for minorities, the poor and the elderly.

Los Angeles County, the Center for Disease Control and Prevention, California State Los Angeles, and the University of California, Los Angeles, recognized Ed with facilities carrying his name. President Clinton awarded Representative Roybal the Presidential Citizens Medal for "exemplary deeds of service for our Nation. These honors stand in constant reminder of the lives he touched through his public service to California and the nation.

When Ed retired, he left us an outstanding legacy when his daughter, LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, was elected to represent a part of his old Congressional district. She continues in that tradition of public service today as a valued friend and colleague. My wife Annette and I extend to her and all her family and friends our most sincere sympathy.

I ask all of my colleagues to join me in remembering a true public servant, Edward Roybal, who served California and our nation with honor, helping to make a better place for all Americans.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of former Representative Edward Roybal who passed away on October 24, 2005. He is survived by his wife, Lucille Beserra Roybal, and his three children, Rep. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, Lillian Roybal-Rose and Edward Roybal, Jr.

Edward Ross Roybal was born on February 10, 1916 in Albuquerque, New Mexico and then moved to the Boyle Heights area of Los Angeles at an early age.

He began his political career as many of us did—by losing his first run for office. In reaction to that defeat, he founded the Los Angeles Community Service Organization (CSO) with the goal of mobilizing Los Angeles's Mexican-Americans against discrimination in housing, employment and education.

In 1949, following a groundswell of support from minority communities, Mr. Roybal was elected to the L.A. City Council, the first Hispanic to serve on the city council in more than a century.

In 1962, he was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives representing an LA District that changed several times during his 30-year tenure in the House.

At the time of his election, he became the first Hispanic from California to serve in Congress since 1879.

He was one of the founding members—and became the first chair—of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus (CHC).

During his time in Congress, he ascended to the powerful Appropriations Committee, where he was an outspoken advocate for funding for education, civil rights, and health programs.

He was one of the first members of Congress to press for HIV/AIDS research funding.

He was a true advocate for senior citizens as well. He served on the Select Committee on Aging—and was the Chairman from 1985 to 1993. He worked tirelessly for the rights of senior citizens and was most proud of his efforts to protect and expand the Meals on Wheels program.

Upon his retirement from Congress in 1992, Representative Roybal was honored to see his daughter—and our colleague—LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD elected to Congress to represent the newly-created 33rd District, which included a portion of the same district that Rep. Ed Roybal had represented in Congress for 30 years.

After leaving Congress, Ed continued to advocate for those he cared most about and founded a non-profit research agency, now called the Edward R. Roybal Institute for Applied Gerontology, at the California State University—Los Angeles campus.

In 1999, the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) honored Rep. Roybal's support for public health programs by naming its main campus in Atlanta in his honor and awarding him its Champion of Prevention Award.

Rep. Roybal was a tireless advocate for the less fortunate. He served his country with honor both in uniform and in this Congress. His contributions will be remembered and celebrated; his death will be deeply mourned.

On behalf of Congress, I extend my deepest sympathies to those he loved and those who loved him. He had a rich life and we can best honor him by striving to live up to his example of how best to serve.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague and good friend from Texas for organizing this Special Order and for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay honor to a visionary leader, a distinguished public servant, and a great American, the late gentleman from California, Edward Roybal. Though I never had the pleasure of serving with Congressman Roybal in the House, I hold him in the highest regard, and I am grateful for the opportunity to join my colleagues in paying tribute to this amazing man.

Today, we mourn the loss of a truly inspiring individual, who spent his long career working to improve the lives of the underprivileged and underrepresented.

During his 30-year tenure in the House of Representatives, Congressman Roybal served with distinction and established himself as a powerful voice in the fight for social justice and a trailblazer among Latino leaders. He rose from the ranks of local politics to become one of the most powerful members of Congress, eventually serving on the House Appropriations Committee.

Though Congressman Roybal was not the most outspoken member of Congress, he was known as a man of action. He worked dili-

gently to give a voice to the voiceless, and fought to make significant policy changes to important issues that affected his constituents, especially the elderly, Latinos, and immigrants.

Even before his political career began, Congressman Roybal was fighting for civil rights and working to create unity in his East Los Angeles community. He established the Community Service Organization, which partnered the Jewish and Mexican-American communities in efforts to end the discrimination he witnessed in education, housing, and employment.

In 1949, Congressman Roybal overcame threats and racism to become the first Hispanic to serve on the Los Angeles City Council in more than a century. Though he faced discrimination, he was not deterred. He used his experiences as motivation to invoke change, and spent his career in public service advocating civil rights. As a leading figure in the Latino community, he worked to address the issues facing his many Latino constituents, whose problems were often ignored. Congressman Roybal understood the importance of supporting the Hispanic community—and in a country with more than 40 million Latinos, we see that his investment in this community was well founded.

As the son of immigrants, I applaud Congressman Roybal's work to protect the rights of those coming to America in search of a better life. He played a pivotal role in getting Congress to support funding initiatives for educational and medical services for immigrants, and he authored the Bilingual Education Act of 1968—the first federal law of its kind.

Congressman Roybal's efforts to help those that society often overlooks did not end there. During his extensive career in this chamber, he played a critical role in developing legislation to improve the lives of the elderly. As the founder and chairman of the House Select Committee on Aging, he was committed to improving housing and health care for our nation's seniors.

In the 1980s, when the country knew little about HIV and AIDS, Congressman Roybal was instrumental in securing funding for research of this deadly disease. His hard work inspired the Centers for Disease Control to rename its main campus after him.

The first Mexican-American to represent a district of California, Congressman Roybal began his career in the House in 1962, joining Henry B. González as the second Hispanic serving in the chamber at that time.

But Congressman Roybal was not content being merely a shining star among Latinos. He made it his personal mission to see that others would follow and served as a mentor to numerous lawmakers and aspiring public servants. He went on to found the Congressional Hispanic Caucus Institute and the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials, both influential organizations that empower Latinos and encourage their participation in politics. Today, thanks in part to CHCI's work and NALEO's advocacy, more than 6,000 Latinos serve in elected and appointed offices. Within the halls of Congress, he founded the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, which today boasts 21 members.

Congressman Roybal helped pave the way for Latinos in politics, and all of us serving in Congress—myself included—owe part of our success to him. I know his daughter, Congresswoman LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, feels

blessed to have had such an inspiring figure in her life, and I'm sure Congressman Roybal enjoyed seeing her continue his legacy in the House.

Once introduced as the "new Mexican councilman who also speaks Mexican," Congressman Roybal not only educated public officials about the Latino community, but created a lasting legacy in Los Angeles, where he has more buildings named after him than almost any other politician in the city.

Congressman Roybal received numerous honors, including two honorary doctor of law degrees and the Presidential Citizens Medal of Honor. But it is not his awards that people will remember. It is his dedication to serving his district and the Nation.

Edward Roybal was a man ahead of his time, who saw beyond the limits society tried to impose. His vision for this country has empowered and improved the lives of many in this Nation—and I would not be standing here in the midst of so many of my distinguished Latino colleagues if it hadn't been for the work of leaders like him. We are impressed by his many accomplishments and truly grateful for his outstanding service.

I would like to offer my sincere condolences to his wife, Lucille, and to my dear colleague, LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, and her entire family. May they take comfort in the proud legacy that Congressman Roybal left behind, and may they find peace in knowing that his mission to defend civil rights and empower Latinos will be taken up and continued by those of us here today.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to one of the most pre-eminent trailblazers in the Hispanic community—the recently departed former Congressman Edward Roybal from the great State of California.

Recently, we celebrated the unveiling of the portrait of Romualdo Pacheco—the first Hispanic elected to this body from the State of California. The man we honor today, Congressman Edward Roybal was the second Hispanic Member of Congress, elected in 1962—over 80 years since Congressman Pacheco served.

Congressman Roybal was a founding member of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus. He was also one of the founding members of the National Association of Latino Elected Officials (NALEO) and the Congressional Hispanic Caucus Institute. He made sure that the voice of the barrio was heard loud and clear in our Nation's capital. His example looms large over all of the work we do today.

Congressman Roybal wrote the first bilingual education law. He was a tireless champion for children and families whose first language was not English. He made a personal commitment to ensuring that language was no barrier to education, health services, voting rights, our court rooms and other areas vital to the community.

He was a champion for elderly Americans. He served on the Select Committee on Aging and fiercely protected programs such as Meals on Wheels.

As we prepare for the reauthorization of the Older Americans Act, his handiwork is evident, and his spirit lives on.

After leaving Congress, he found new venues for his advocacy. In 1993, former Representative Roybal used his leftover campaign funds to found a non-profit research agency dedicated to improving the quality and effec-

tiveness of health and human service delivery to older persons, now called the Edward R. Roybal Institute for Applied Gerontology at the California State University—Los Angeles campus.

Here in the halls of Congress, his legacy continues. The Congressional Hispanic Caucus that he founded is now 21 members strong and poised for growth. His daughter, our friend and colleague, Congresswoman LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, carries on the family tradition of service and great leadership. LUCILLE has earned the respect of Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle the same way her father did it during his many years of service in Washington.

The best way we can honor Edward Roybal's memory is to continue the fight to improve the quality of life for our community— young and old, immigrant and native born, English speakers and speakers of other languages. To the Roybal family, I offer my heartfelt condolences and my pledge to continue the fight.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in tribute to the late California Congressman Ed Roybal.

Ed Roybal left this nation a rich legacy. He was a civil rights and social justice champion. He was an advocate for those least likely to have a voice—the poor and the elderly. Ed Roybal consistently fought to invest in people, seeing the long-term benefit and future pay-off of this investment.

But Ed Roybal also forged a path in politics creating new opportunities for many Hispanics. Not only was Ed an inspiration to future generation, he' actively worked to encourage many in the Hispanic community to explore a future in politics—personally serving as a mentor to a number of future elected officials.

While I did not serve with Ed Roybal, my late husband did. Bob was honored to have served in the House of Representatives with him, as he greatly admired Ed. They shared a similar philosophy. Both chose not to allow discrimination in their youth define their role in life. Instead of condemning intolerance in this nation, Ed Roybal, chose to serve and make it a better place.

To my friend and colleague, LUCILLE and the entire Roybal family, please accept my deepest condolences on your loss.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, Edward Roybal was a man of dignity and determination. I had the great pleasure of serving in Congress with him for 10 years. During that time, we worked very closely on immigration issues and on many matters affecting Los Angeles and California. He was not only a colleague, but my mentor and my friend.

Ed served his country in the Army during World War II and returned to serve it as one of America's political trailblazers.

Beginning with his first election to the Los Angeles City Council in 1949, Ed's distinguished career in politics spanned more than six decades. He was the first Hispanic elected to the Council since 1881 and he served there for four terms. It would take 23 additional years before another Mexican American took a seat on the City Council.

Although "just" a city official, Ed was a vociferous critic of the excesses of the House Un-American Activities Committee—and Jewish leaders in Los Angeles well remember how he stepped forward in the early 1950s to welcome the prime minister of Israel to the City of Angels.

In 1962, he was elected to Congress—the first Hispanic from California to serve in Congress since 1879. From that first campaign, the support given him by his constituents was unwavering. He never received less than 66 percent in a general election. The three times he was challenged in a primary, he won by more than 80 percent.

From his position as chairman of the Appropriation Committee's Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government, he sought funding for Alzheimer's victims, and for Alzheimer's disease research.

He introduced a medigap proposal, and had a universal health care bill. He promoted a measure to offset a national nursing shortage by providing funds to recruit and raise the salaries of nurses.

He also took on the cause of mental health treatment, passing provisions that expanded demonstration projects for rural mental health care and establishing a national mental health education program.

In 1985, he succeeded Representative Claude Pepper as chairman of the Select Committee on Aging. The two of them worked long and hard to provide funding for long-term health care for the chronically ill. In the 101st Congress, he helped enact legislation that reversed a 1989 Supreme Court ruling allowing age-based discrimination in employee benefits.

As a founding member and the first chairman of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, Ed mounted strong opposition to the Simpson-Mazzoli immigration bill because it imposed sanctions on U.S. employers who hired illegal immigrants. He worked against this provision with such intensity that it had to be brought up in three Congresses—two as Simpson-Mazzoli and one as Simpson-Rodino—before it finally won passage. I supported it, and learned in the process, that he could be not only a good friend, but a worthy adversary.

After his retirement from Congress, Ed maintained his interest in health care and public health programs and to this end, he founded the Edward R. Roybal Institute for Applied Gerontology at UCLA. The Centers for Disease Control named its Atlanta campus after him and named him their "Champion of Prevention"—an honor reserved for individuals who have made significant contributions to public health. He was also honored by President Clinton with the highest civilian award in the Nation—the Presidential Medal of Freedom—for his "exemplary deeds of service for our Nation."

No award meant more to him than the affection and respect of his family. He was enormously proud of his three children, LUCILLE, Lillian and Edward, Jr.—and I am certain that he was greatly pleased that his oldest daughter followed him into public service and into this great body, where U.S. Representative LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD serves with dedication and distinction and where she is one of my favorite colleagues.

I am privileged today to tell you of my enormous regard and high esteem for Edward R. Roybal—a mentor for a whole generation of Hispanic community leaders, a prominent national advocate for the elderly and the infirm, and a great champion for civil rights and social justice.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the life of my former colleague, Edward Ross Roybal.

Ed Roybal lived an extraordinary life. As a young man growing up during the Great Depression, he joined the Civilian Conservation Corps. Later he served his country in World War II.

He made his jump into politics—and into history—in 1949. Ed was elected to the Los Angeles City Council, becoming the Council's first Hispanic Member in over 100 years. After 13 years of distinguished service to Los Angeles, Ed was elected to the House of Representatives.

From 1963 to 1993, Ed Roybal served this House—and his constituents—with distinction. He was a quiet power on the Appropriations Committee and used his enormous influence to help those who needed help the most. He worked tirelessly for funding health and civil rights programs and spearheaded efforts to restore funding for programs benefiting the nation's elderly population. He was ultimately successful in preserving the widely used Meals on Wheels program.

In 1976, Ed was one of the founding members of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus and served as its first chair. He was also one of the founding members of the National Association of Latino Elected Officials, NALEO, as well as the Congressional Hispanic Caucus Institute.

After deciding not to run for re-election in 1992, Ed's daughter, LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD was elected to Congress to carry on Ed's essential work.

His service to his community did not end when he left public office. In 1993, Ed established a non-profit research organization committed to efficient health and human service delivery to the elderly. The center is now known as the Edward R. Roybal Institute for Applied Gerontology. In 2001, Ed Roybal received the Presidential Citizens Medal from President Clinton. And in 2004, the Mexican-American Political Association honored him as a "Latino Legend of the 20th Century."

Ed Roybal will always be remembered as a dedicated community activist and a devoted public servant who always made the needs of those he served paramount. His life and work will continue to serve as an example to us all. I was proud to have served in the House with him and I consider him a friend and mentor.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, today we mourn the loss of a 20th Century American giant, Congressman Edward Roybal. When I got to Congress so many years ago, there were not many people in Washington that I could identify with or look up to as a role model. There were just a few Hispanics in Congress when I arrived there. Nobody stood taller than Ed Roybal in my eyes. He was already a legend in Congress and Los Angeles.

Lord knows we were different—he was a businessman from California, I was a sheriff from Texas. But we were more the same for our backgrounds in families that came from modest means. We both represented a large number of low income people.

We met in 1976—the year the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, or CHC—was founded. Even then he was organizing the nation's elected Hispanic officials; and as a County Commissioner in Texas, I was invited to a conference on Hispanic matters.

My first impression was that a gentleman he was, and how smart and well-organized. He seemed to know everybody and know everything about the organs of government at all

levels. He was a charming and gentle mentor. Paying tribute to Ed Roybal is to remember that to see the future, you must stand on the shoulders of a giant. And this Hispanic pioneer had giant shoulders on which we all stand today.

When Ed came to Congress in 1963, he was nearly alone as a Hispanic member of Congress. He faced quite a quandary: While he represented a Los Angeles area district, he carried the hopes and dreams of a growing segment of the population that lived all over the Nation.

When he left Congress in early 1993, he saw not only his beloved daughter win a seat in Congress—he witnessed yet another growth spurt of the number of Hispanic members sitting in Congress. That year our Caucus grew to 20 members, quadrupling the membership just over a decade earlier when Ed founded the CHC.

Ed knew that he and his Hispanic colleagues: Herman Badillo, Kika de la Garza, Henry Gonzalez, and Baltasar Corrada del Rio represented disjointed districts and the interests of the national Hispanic community. It was Ed's leadership in this group that led to the creation of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus in 1976.

When he talked about the formation of the CHC, he talked about the use of other Hispanic members as a "force multiplier"—or the philosophy that more people working together created more opportunities and more information for the larger national community. In the beginning, there were just the five members and they all sat on various committees. Ed knew if there was a central organization for the sitting members, it would be easier for all of them to know what was coming in the various committees.

In Washington, information is power. Ed understood that and through the CHC the Hispanics in Congress shared information in a regular, organized way.

He was an extraordinary visionary. Just as he organized the Hispanic members of Congress to maximize our numbers to serve the larger Hispanic population—Ed also carried that vision beyond Capitol Hill.

He helped create the National Association of Latino Elected Officials, NALEO, which connects the Hispanic office holders around the Nation.

Visiting Ed's Capitol Hill office was to take a walk through the important events of the 20th Century.

There were pictures of Ed with President Kennedy, with President Johnson, with Cesar Chavez, and with dozens of other bigger-than-life people. His office seemed almost like a living museum.

He loved his wife very much. They were a beautiful couple. They were always together and he was so attentive.

He was forever explaining to the younger members: the issues are large and complex, and our population is growing, be smart. He was enormously respected on both sides of the aisle and that may have been the legacy he will be remembered for by those of us who labor on Capitol Hill.

Ed never believed the other party was bad or evil; he knew we were all Americans, and we all wanted the best for our Nation.

He brought his considerable business sense to our cause.

Realizing that our future was literally ours to shape, Ed founded, in 1978, a non-profit

called the Congressional Hispanic Caucus Institute, whose main purpose was: "each one, teach one."

CHCI, the Institute, was created to bring young people to Capitol Hill each year, put them in congressional offices to learn and understand the dynamics of our government, then send them back to their communities with more savvy about affecting change at the national level. In the early 1980s after my service in Congress began, Ed pointed out that we were wasting precious resources on rent for the Institute on Capitol Hill and insisted that we buy a building. He told us this was literally an investment in our children's future, and in the future of the Hispanic community. As always, he was right.

While Ed was a quiet man, he had an unwavering commitment to the principles of justice and compassion and to the poor, the elderly and the disenfranchised. He had an enormous heart, a quick wit, and was among the smartest members I ever served with. I was always fascinated by his stories of his early days in the 1960s when the population of Hispanic members of Congress could be counted on one hand. Many of his stories reminded me of experiences many of us shared—how other members of Congress were surprised that he spoke English fluently, with exceptional diction how people didn't think he was Mexican because he didn't have a long mustache or wear a sombrero.

Ed Roybal's legacy simply cannot be measured but it can be found in policies he championed, in the organizations he created to further the cause of Hispanic Americans, in the thousands of young lives he touched and influenced during the course of his amazing public service and in the service of his daughter who went on to follow in his footsteps in Congress.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, at the recent memorial service for our former colleague the Honorable Edward Roybal of California, whom we remember tonight, my distinguished friend the Honorable DAVID DREIER delivered a moving eulogy. The remarks that I will submit for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD include Mr. DREIER's recollections of the powerful influence that our friend Mr. Roybal had on this House. It is in that same bipartisan spirit that I compliment my colleague, Mr. DREIER, for his comments. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Mr. DREIER be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE DAVID DREIER HONORING FORMER CONGRESSMAN ED ROYBAL, NOVEMBER 15, 2005

Mr. Speaker, recently, our nation lost two icons in the battle for equal rights. Twenty-five years before Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat on that bus in Montgomery, Alabama, a young Ed Roybal was in the vanguard of the struggle for equality here in Los Angeles.

Speeches are given in Congress every day. Mr. Roybal's account of his fight for justice was one of the most memorable speeches I've ever heard.

He told a packed House chamber that the Evergreen swimming pool in Boyle Heights was a favorite neighborhood hangout where fun was had by all. There was just one problem. They would only allow Mexican Americans to swim the day before the pool was to be cleaned. Still a teenager, Ed Roybal led the effort to overturn that abhorrent policy.

Without bitterness or anger but with resolve he spent the rest of his life confronting the Evergreen pools that pervade our culture and laws.

The Times called him, "a mentor to scores of lawmakers." I hope this doesn't upset anyone but he had at least one Republican protege who has been inspired by his example. Mr. Roybal was a giant in public service. A gracious man, who through his conscience and his actions was one of the great leaders of this city and our nation.

I have served in Congress for twenty-five years. It has been an honor to be a colleague of Mr. Roybal's for half that time and a colleague of Lucille's for the other half. There is no greater tribute to his legacy than the dedication of his daughter to the very same ideals and beliefs that guided him.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart at the loss but pride for the service of Congressman Ed Roybal that we yield back the balance of our time.

MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION PART D DRUG PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I have an hour as the designee to talk about the subject that I want to bring to my colleagues, but I think I need to take at least a few seconds of my time from this side of the aisle to express my and our heartfelt sympathies to our colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD), on the death of her father.

I spent the last 15 minutes listening to their special hour and learning about that great, great American who represented the State of California so well in this body for 30 years; and I want to express my sympathy to my colleague from California.

Mr. Speaker, today, November 15, is a historic day and not just because it is my wife Billie's birthday, which it is. Happy birthday, honey. But really the historic aspect of today is the roll-out and the sign-up today for the first of a 6-month window of opportunity for our seniors to voluntarily sign up for the Medicare part D prescription drug plan which this Congress made available to them in December of 2003. So indeed, Mr. Speaker, today, November 15, is indeed a historic day.

I have seen clips of the original signing of the Medicare legislation back in 1965 when President Lyndon Baines Johnson signed that bill into law. Actually, the very first person to sign up for the other voluntary part of Medicare, the part B which is applicable to the physician care and outpatient testing, not the hospital part but the voluntary part, the first individual to sign up for that was former President Harry Truman, that being 40 years ago.

Here we are now finally, Mr. Speaker, after all of these years, offering something that was left out of that original program, I guess for a fairly good reason. Maybe back then, I was a freshman in medical school, I barely knew who was happening, but there was not

quite the emphasis then on prescription drug treatment. We had some good prescriptions but not nearly what is available to our public and our seniors today; and there was much more emphasis on trying to get hospital care and needed surgery, emergency room care, indeed long-term care, skilled nursing home care for people who had, as an example, suffered a stroke.

So this was all very, very important in the program; and I know my colleagues on both sides of the aisle would agree with me it has been a great success. There was some concern, though, I remember this much about it as I was working as a scrub technician during the summertime hearing the doctors at the scrub sink before they went into surgery, talking about this new law that was going into effect, this Medicare bill. There was some naysayers, no question about it, and some were downright opposed to it. But so many seniors were living in poverty and not getting needed health care, and it at that time was a Godsend for them.

Mr. Speaker, I will say this. I think today, starting today, November 15, 2005, some 40 years later another Godsend is coming to our seniors, brought to them by this Congress and this President, this administration, and that is the Medicare part D prescription drug coverage. It is especially a Godsend for those seniors who are living at or near the Federal poverty level, and I say that because heretofore they have not been able to afford prescription drugs.

They go to their doctor and get maybe a handful of prescriptions because many of our seniors who are living just off of a Social Security check are the very ones that have what are called co-morbidities, more than one disease, maybe high blood pressure, heart disease and diabetes; and they need to take four or five or maybe six prescriptions a day. They are the very ones who cannot afford it, not that they do not want to. They want to take care of themselves, but they also want to eat, and they want to have a roof over their head, and they have to pay their utility bills, so this program is so necessary for them.

In the past, Mr. Speaker, what has been happening is they would put off taking care of themselves because they have could not afford the prescriptions. Then, when some catastrophe would occur, they would finally get care, whether it was in the emergency room because their high blood pressure led to a stroke or whether it was on the operating table because their blood sugar, their diabetes was out of control and led to a limb becoming gangrenous and needed an amputation or maybe even because of high cholesterol they would have to have open heart surgery.

□ 2130

We have finally begun this prescription drug part D sign-up as of today, and that is what makes November 15, 2005, so historic.

I want to spend most of my time then talking about this aspect of the Medicare Modernization Act of 2003. There are other things that I think are going to be tremendously helpful.

I will mention just briefly, Mr. Speaker, the fact that with this change in the law, for the first time a senior can actually go to his or her internist or family practitioner, we call them primary care specialist, and get a complete, thorough physical examination when they turn 65, if you want to call it an entry-level physical examination. In the past, that was not paid for, and a lot of these diseases that I have already spoken of in their earlier stages have no symptoms at all, and people really do not know, but with this new program, they get an opportunity to go have that physical exam.

Also included in the modernization piece is the coverage for a lot of screening tests that were not included in the original Medicare. I am talking about things like mammograms, screening for breast cancer obviously; colonoscopies, screening for colon cancer; PSA blood testing, screening for prostate cancer. I am talking about checking blood sugar. I am talking about getting a cholesterol level to see if the patient needs to be on one of these statin drugs that do such a great job of hopefully preventing heart attacks.

All of this is now available to our seniors. I am not going to spend a lot of time, as I say, Mr. Speaker, on that aspect of the bill because I really do want to spend most of the hour talking about the prescription drug part because it is so important.

I have got a few posters here, and we will be referring to them from time to time. I also have some of my colleagues that have worked so hard and been so supportive of this legislation and are working hard in their districts as we roll out this program. As they go home, usually we get back into the district on Thursday or Friday morning, and I know a lot of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle are holding town hall meetings and trying to explain to the seniors and assure them that although this is somewhat complicated, there are people there to help them through the process and encouraging them, especially the low-income individuals that I spoke of, to sign up and sign up early.

They do have 6 months to do it. It starts November 15, today, and goes until May 15 of 2006. They have that window of opportunity; but it would be a real mistake, particularly for our low-income seniors, not to get signed up before the end of the year because the program really starts, Mr. Speaker, and I know my colleagues are aware of this, it starts on January 1. So if they wait till the last minute into May of 2006, they will have actually missed 5 months of opportunity, in many instances, to get their prescription drugs with hardly any cost, and I will repeat that, with hardly any cost except

maybe \$1 if their medication is a generic drug and \$3 to \$5 if it is a brand-name prescription drug.

So I will have a number of my colleagues joining me, and we will be calling on them in just a few minutes. I want them to take as much time as they would like to talk about what they are doing in their districts, how they feel about this program, what sort of feedback they are getting from their seniors, and then maybe we will engage also in a little bit of colloquy.

Let me call my colleagues' attention to this first slide, which I think begins to tell the story: "Helping seniors get the medicine they need to stay well." That is what it is all about. It is not an emphasis on episodic treatment and maybe trying to catch the horse after the barn door has been left open when some catastrophe occurs. It is so much more difficult, rather, to get the medicine they need to stay well. I do not think we can really emphasize that too much.

Now, Medicare helps seniors prevent disease in addition to treating it. I said at the outset, in 1965, all of the emphasis was on treating it, and that was good, but not the 21st century medicine. We need to emphasize the prevention of disease.

Medicare part D, it is important that our seniors know that this option, prescription drug coverage, really is for all seniors. It is not just the low-income. I mentioned them, and we will talk about throughout the hour, but no matter what a person's income, if they are a Medicare recipient, either because they are 65 years old, and that is probably 36 or 37 million in this country, or because of a disability at a younger age, and there are probably 6 million or 7 million of our citizens who are on Medicare because of a disability, but all of them, no matter what their income level, they are eligible for Medicare part D.

As I point out in this next slide, it is a voluntary program. Seniors must choose to enroll. They will be getting lots of information and have gotten lots of information, whether it is public service announcements on television or mail pieces that have come from CMS, the Committee on Medicare and Medicaid Services, information maybe they obtained from a senior center, from their physician's office or, indeed, from their Member of Congress' office, either in Washington or in the district, but they do have to make that decision. It cannot and will not be made for them.

There are going to be many plans. Seniors will have a choice of plans. We estimate that the monthly premium, and it is premium-based just like Medicare part B, Mr. Speaker, is a premium-based and an optional program. By the way, I would guess that I am accurate in saying that 98 percent, maybe more, of seniors have chosen and will continue to choose to enroll in that premium-based part B that covers the doctor's expense and outpatient testing

and surgery because it is a very good deal.

We will talk a little bit later about what percentage of seniors we think will want to sign up for the Medicare part D, the prescription drug part; but it will be a substantial number. We are estimating that the monthly premiums for that monthly benefit will be about \$25 on average, some plans less, some plans more, depending on what the coverage is.

All Medicare-approved plans cover both prescription and generic drugs, and they are accepted at local pharmacies. That is very important because people want to know if they can continue to go to that corner druggist. In no way am I suggesting that the chains, the Eckerdts, the Walgreens, the CVSs that do such a great job, are not a wonderful place to go and get prescriptions filled. They are. Many of our seniors will choose that type of location, but others who have a pharmacist friend that they have known for many years, they call them doctor and go to church with them, a lot of times they are able to charge their prescriptions and pay a little bit along, the kind of service that only a small corner druggist can give. That is very important that they know that they will be able to continue as part of this program to be serviced by those great pharmacists that we call corner druggists.

Mr. Speaker, before I call on my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER), for his remarks, I want to just present one more poster; and, again, I do not think we can emphasize this too much, that is, this issue of the dates; and I have already mentioned several times that today is the starting date, November 15, for enrollment. This little icon, if you will, shows an hourglass, and that means that starting today the sands of time, that 6 months, is ticking away. Of course, the program, if you get signed up right away, you reap the benefits starting January 1. Then if you sign up before May 15, that 6-month window, then you incur no penalties; but after that, there are some penalties for signing up late. Again, I am sure some of my colleagues will talk about that.

At this time, I am very happy to see the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) with me again to share one of these hours on health care issues. The judge knows a lot about legal issues and the judiciary, but he also knows a lot about health care. So I am honored at this time to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY), my good friend, for yielding to me; and I actually came down here because, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is probably one of the people that has dedicated more time and effort to the health care issues that affect the American public than any other Member of this Congress.

On many occasions, he has educated me on health care issues and given me

good advice and good counsel on how we need to make health care available, because the health of our Nation is very important to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) and all Members of this House on both sides of the aisle. We battle and toil with how exactly we are going to address health care issues.

I really wanted to start and come down here and share with the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) an absolutely true event that happened to me personally; I guess by now it is probably almost 2 years ago or maybe even better. It was right after I was blessed to join this august body.

I was back home in my district, and I was back at my pharmacy, that I am not going to advertise for, but where I regularly buy my prescription drugs. I was standing in line for my turn to get prescription drugs, and I am sure people have told this story that I never had actually experienced, a story like this, until I heard the story.

There was a lady that was at that time being waited on by the pharmacist there at the counter and getting her prescription drugs, and they brought them to her. She was getting two prescriptions as I recall, one for herself and one for her husband. I do not know how old this lady was, but she was clearly on Social Security because she said so. This was when we were still working on trying to come up with a prescription drug benefit that would help our senior citizens.

She asked the pharmacist how much the two prescriptions were going to be. The price was very expensive for both of the drugs that she was going to have to pay, and between the two drugs, it was going to add up to, as I recall, over \$500 for these prescriptions. She told the pharmacist, well, I cannot get these two prescriptions and continue to feed my husband and me on what we have to live on; I am just not going to be able to do it. Would it be possible that I could get half of the prescription?

The pharmacist said, well, ma'am, the one for you was obviously for something that had come upon her. The other was an ongoing prescription for her husband, the way I understood it. He said, your doctor has a reason he wants you to have this whole prescription. It may have been an antibiotic or something like that. I am not in the medical profession, but the pharmacist clearly said you need to take all of this prescription; you just cannot take half. Well, she said, ma'am, I just cannot spend that kind of money and take care of my family.

When you heard that, when you actually heard that from a human being, you said to yourself, we have got to do something to get some relief for people like this lady that was standing there. I was two people back from her in line, and what I heard that day from that lady touched my heart to where I really felt like I had seen the crisis firsthand.

□ 2145

We have now put together Medicare part D, as my colleague from Georgia has been explaining and will be able to explain in far better detail than I can as to what the benefits are for this, but we have now got a solution for that lady who was standing in line, and it is now time for people to start going out and getting signed up for Medicare part D. That is why I wanted to come join my colleague tonight in the hopes that people in my district and people across this entire country will hear our message that the time is here. We have arrived at the time when they need to go down and register to get involved in Medicare part D. And benefits will actually start, as Mr. GINGREY has explained, in January of 2006.

Now, I have traveled my district and I hold town hall meetings, and a lot of our senior citizens are concerned about, well, this seems so complicated, I do not know whom to turn to. And we are here to let the people know this is important to them and their loved ones. There are people there to assist them.

I would ask the families of those Medicare recipients that need help, sometimes as we grow into our later years, little things become big things to folks like my parents, who now are deceased, but I can remember when they become big things for them as we grow older. And I would hope that the families of these people along with these folks will encourage them to go look into getting registered, getting set up in a plan.

There are multiple plans that are offered. There are people there to help them understand those plans. There are people to tell them what fits their life, their life-style, where they come from, and I would hope not only those people who are going to be eligible for the program but those people who have folks in their family that will be eligible for the program will encourage them to go down and talk to folks, get the help, get signed up.

It is not as complicated as people think it is. There is a lot of fear that is unwarranted fear of this program. It happens on everything we do. When we deal with the government in many areas in our lives, dealing with the government is a frightening thing, dealing with plans and paperwork. This is cut down to where it is not going to be that hard to understand the plans.

There are people there to look at what people's circumstances are and tell them and show them which plans offer them the best options. Every State except Alaska has a State plan, as I recall. There are regional plans, and there are 10 nationwide plans that are available. There are multiple options that they can talk to them about. People can talk to their pharmacists. Medicare has people that will help them.

Call that number, 1-800-Medicare, and they will explain how to sign up. It is so important to your family. Do not

let a little fear or a new world attitude that you do not understand keep you from getting signed up for a benefit. Because this is going to be able to assist all Americans in their health care needs, and it is especially going to be of great assistance to those people who are in the lower economic sector of our country. In most instances, those people who make, I think, \$11,500 as an individual and \$22,000 as a couple, they are basically not going to have hardly any Medicare costs for drugs. So it is important that you not let the fear of a new program or something you might have seen on television or some political rhetoric that was in some campaign somewhere that got you concerned that you would not be able to understand what the program is about to keep you from getting what you need so that you never have to be like that lady who stood in line in front of me and have to make a decision as to whether you took your medicine.

Does my colleague know what was really loving about that story? There was no question she was going to buy her husband's medicine. She never even blinked on that. She was saying, I will give up so we can live our life here what I need, but of course there is no question I am buying the medicine for my husband.

That kind of love permeates American society, and I think we have a duty to our loved ones who are eligible for Medicare to help them and encourage them to go get signed up for this. Because Americans do care about their elderly. Americans do care about those senior citizens who have given all that they had for us today. It is time for us to give them the benefits that they need so they do not ever have to have the kind of experience that that sweet lady did who was standing in front of me at the drugstore.

That is why I came down here tonight, to join Congressman GINGREY and speak directly to the American people and say, get out there and help, get out there and get yourself registered, or get somebody to help you get registered, because these benefits are important. There are occasions now where people say, right now, prescription drug benefits do not mean much to me. One never knows what is right down the road, and it is important that people get registered now and have those benefits available. Because in the month of May, they may come down with something where they have got a permanent situation where for the rest of their life they are going to be taking medicine, and if they had not gotten registered, then they would be in a scramble trying to get registered. So it is important to look at it now.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I think is most important as we sit here this evening is to encourage our seniors and their families to assist our seniors to get out and learn about the program and get signed up. Getting signed up is what it is all about. Trained professionals are available 24

hours a day, 7 days a week at 1-800-Medicare.

They have got a Web site, and I am reading from Congressman GINGREY's sign, www.Medicare.gov, for those high-tech seniors, who are probably better at that than I am, to get out there and do this on-line. There is a lot of help available.

I hope that that lady who was standing in line in front of me in the drugstore in Round Rock, Texas, I hope she hears, by accident or whatever, channel surfing, and tunes into this show tonight and will say "I had better go do that."

I think our colleagues on both sides of the aisle are going to be out in our districts talking to people and saying do not let something new keep you away. Get out there and get involved and get signed up.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Texas for being with me. I appreciate his comments tonight. I welcome him to, if possible, to stay around and maybe we can get involved in a colloquy or I can respond to his questions and yield to him.

Mr. Speaker, the thing that he pointed out, that little anecdote, true story, about that little lady in Round Rock, that is why it is so important. I appreciate Judge Carter mentioning that, because this is real, and the emphasis that he put in his remarks on how important it is to get signed up is real.

Thanksgiving is going to be upon us pretty soon. I think I am correct in saying a week from Thursday. And what comes the day after? Well, I call it "black Friday," Mr. Speaker. That is that big shopping day, the first day of the Christmas season when everybody hits the malls. I think that would be a great day for families, children, grandchildren to sit down with their grandparents, children to sit down with their parents and help them. That would be a wonderful day. It would save money as well, probably. The retailers may not like me very much, Mr. Speaker, for mentioning that, but that would be a great day to just sit down and say, look, I am pretty good at the computer, Mom, Dad, and let us go on-line, let us get on www.Medicare.gov.

If I tried to do that, that computer would start smoking, and everybody in my office knows that. Anytime I need to do anything on the computer, they have to hold my hand. So I understand the need and the fear of computers. But really for the younger people especially, it is a challenge. It is pretty easy for them. They have learned it in high school and college, and some of them even work in the industry. So help is readily available, as Judge Carter said; and it is not that difficult.

I called this morning. I think it was about 8:30, and I decided I was just going to call 1-800-Medicare just to see how long it took to get somebody on the telephone. Mr. Speaker, I had a response in about 3 minutes. The first time I dialed, I got a busy signal, and

so I immediately, within a matter of seconds, dialed again and got right through and began the process.

Now I am not quite 65, and I did not have a card and a number, so at some point I had to quit. I had to hang up. It was a bogus call. But I was very impressed.

Of course, CMS has hired and trained, and that is very important, not just hired but trained probably by a factor of four the number of employees that they normally have responding to these calls. So, as Judge CARTER said, that information, that help is there, whether it is by the telephone or on the Web site, and we will get into the specifics of how a senior prepares themselves for this process. There is something called worksheets that are available through CMS. Those are easily obtained, and people just kind of go through that worksheet. We will talk about it a little later in the hour, so that when those questions come up, and, again, they are not difficult, they know the answers, and we can help them through the process.

Mr. Speaker, I see that we have been joined by another of our colleagues and not just any colleague because this is my good friend and fellow physician, indeed a fellow OB-GYN physician who came in in the 108th Congress with Judge CARTER and me, the gentleman from Texas.

So I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) to give us a little of his insight into this program and what he is doing in his district.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I thank him for once again bringing this subject to the floor of the House.

It is a timely subject. Here we are celebrating Medicare's 40th birthday; and, Mr. Speaker, as the Members will recall, 2 years and 1 week ago we actually passed this legislation, on November 22 of 2003, which now has become the Medicare Modernization Act and with it the prescription drug plan.

Mr. Speaker, I have been doing town hall events and informational groupings throughout my district, and my district is pretty diverse. I have been very fortunate. I have had someone there from CMS with me, and together I think we have been able to answer a lot of the questions that come up. I do not want to get ahead of the program that Dr. GINGREY has proposed for this evening, but the concept of the worksheet, the concept of prearranging some of the information in an organized fashion, is a critical one. It is so important because we are coming up on a time of year of celebration of holidays, Thanksgiving and Christmas holiday, when families are going to be together. It is a great opportunity for them to talk, after they have had all the football and turkey that they can handle, to sit down and talk about what are the changes that are coming up in this Medicare program.

The gentleman alluded to calling 1-800-Medicare. I must admit I have not

had the courage to do that myself, but I do go on the Internet, and we can go into the plan selector part on www.Medicare.gov. They do ask for their Medicare number, but if they scroll down that page just a little bit, they can actually fill out the plan finder information without giving up any information, if they just want to check and see what is available.

I have done this for Texas. We have got in excess of 40 plans available to seniors in the Lone Star State, and they are good plans. Some of them come in with less of a premium and less of a deductible than what Medicare proposes. In fact, I have seen premiums as low as \$10 and \$20, and I have seen some programs with a zero dollar deductible.

A lot has been made about the so-called gap in coverage that occurs at some levels. And do remember, Mr. Speaker, we passed this legislation 2 years ago, and what were we trying to do? We knew we could not cover every last single person in this country, so we wanted to provide the greatest amount of coverage to those who were the poorest and those who were the sickest, and I think we did a good job in accomplishing that. But it does leave a gap in coverage, or at least the Medicare proposal, the proposal for the Medicare prescription drug plan, was to leave a gap. But, actually, there are some plans in Texas where, if they are willing to accept generics, there is, in fact, no gap in coverage. So there is complete coverage from the first dollar spent up and to the so-called catastrophic ranges.

I have had some people complain about the time frame that is available to sign up for this program. It starts today, and for the next 6 months people can sign up for any of the Medicare-eligible programs. Those who have not signed up by May 15, right now Medicare is proposing a 1 percent penalty per month. That will be 32 cents penalty the first month of June of 2006, and it will continue at a 1 percent per month increase thereafter.

□ 2200

But realistically, this should be thought of as insurance and not an entitlement. That is what I have tried to explain to my constituents when they say they do not like the idea that you are forcing me to sign up. It is a voluntary program. If you decide it is not for you, you are absolutely free not to sign up.

But when I was a physician and I offered health insurance to my employees, they would be expected to pay a small part of it. If they chose not to pay that part, they could opt not to take the insurance. But they could not just wait until they got sick and then say, I would like to sign up for the insurance. Otherwise, it would not be fair to the rest of the people who have been paying their premiums all along. The program is structured to look like commercial insurance. It is on purpose

not scheduled to look like an entitlement, because it is not. It is insurance coverage for seniors who need help with paying for their prescription drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I would just stress as a last point that when people evaluate these plans for their families or for themselves, that they look at cost, coverage, and they look at convenience. Many of the plans cost less than what Medicare has proposed.

The coverage part is important. You want to be certain that you pick a plan that covers the medicines that you are actually taking. Talk it over with your doctor. If your doctor is watching a problem like a mildly elevated blood pressure, be sure that those medications would likely be covered. Every plan lists on the Web site how many of the top 100 prescriptions covered by Medicare that particular plan covers. Most are in the high-90 range. I have not seen one less than 82 or 83 of the top 100 prescriptions covered by Medicare. But check out the coverage.

Finally, convenience. They will provide a pharmacy that is close by. If your neighborhood pharmacy is the one you want to use because they have a delivery boy you like, use that tool to help you decide which one of those pharmacies you want to use. There is also mail order.

There is a lot of flexibility in these plans. Yes, it is complicated. Health care is complicated in the 21st century. These are not easy decisions. Yet at the same time, Tom Brokaw called you the Greatest Generation. You beat the Nazis, solved the problems of the Great Depression, and solved a lot of the problems related to civil rights. Seniors can solve these problems as well.

This program will become streamlined over time. I am happy about things like disease management and physicals that will be offered now. It is good legislation. Mr. Speaker, it is good medicine.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, one thing that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) mentioned was the fact that if a senior is interested in a mail order opportunity, then as they go through that list, the litany of companies that provide a benefit, they may want to choose one that would allow them to get their drugs in a mail-order fashion. So that option is available.

I had mentioned earlier in the evening talking about the worksheet and what a senior would need to have if they are dialing the 1-800 Medicare number or dialing the Web site with or without assistance at www.Medicare.gov, or coming to one of the congressional offices to get help, they need that work sheet and that work sheet should include and should already be filled out.

Again, it is information that the seniors know. First and foremost, it should include a list of the prescription drugs that you are currently taking, including the dosage, the milligram, the strength, if you will, and how often you are taking those drugs.

Secondly, information about any prescription drug coverage you currently have, be it employer or union-sponsored or a Medigap policy. Or maybe you are a veteran and have TRICARE for Life, or possibly you are retired State or Federal employee and you have coverage that includes a prescription drug benefit. You need to have that information so we can put that into the formula and help you decide whether you want to continue with that program or opt for the Medicare part D program, whichever is better, whichever really is the best deal, unique to your situation.

And of course the name and address, as Mr. BURGESS and Mr. CARTER both said, the name of the local pharmacy that you use to fill prescriptions. So we will need your ZIP Code as well and the out-of-pocket amount you spend on prescription drugs each year currently. Again, I know our seniors know that because they are real good accountants. They have to watch every dollar, and it is important that we know that. And then last but not least, your Medicare enrollment information, your Medicare number and your address and all of those particulars, whether you are on traditional Medicare or Medicare Advantage under an HMO or PPO-type program.

Mr. Speaker, I see that we are joined by another health care professional, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY). Mr. MURPHY has been with us on just about all of these hours that we have done on health care and this particular issue.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding to me. I thought it would be helpful to point out a couple of things. When an individual contacts 1-800 Medicare or Medicare.gov, when they have their name, address, medications and dosage level, and what they are paying for it and their ZIP Code, they can find out a number of things. They will be able to compare the cost of medications. Because with the 75 percent discount, 75 percent paid by their tax dollars and other folks' taxes for the first couple thousand, and then after \$5,000, 95 percent is paid for by the government, but from this it is important to be able to compare medications.

I have a chart here. This is Pennsylvania, my home State. I want to point out something, and that is savings for seniors with multiple chronic conditions for someone in Pennsylvania, this is comparing the savings in the best plan and savings in an average plan. Let me read. Jane is a hypothetical medical beneficiary taking the following medications: Celebrex, 200 milligrams; Fosamax, 70 milligrams; Nexium, 40 milligrams; Singulair, 10 milligrams; Zolof, 50 milligrams; and metoprolol tartrate, 50 milligrams.

What comes out of this is in the best plan it appears there is about a 60 percent savings, or \$3,797. In the average plan, about a 32 percent savings, being \$2,036 of what they will pay. I am not

sure what sort of medical condition this is, and perhaps you can diagnose based upon the medications alone, but I am just interested in your comments on this because it becomes a matter, it is one of the reasons when somebody calls and says how much is my discount going to be, it gets complex. In each case, you have to look at the individual's prescriptions.

I wonder if my physician friends here can tell just what this tells them and why it is a matter that deals with the discussions of Medicare.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I call on the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and enter into a colloquy with you on that issue.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, my understanding is you will be offered the top three plans based on cost to evaluate. Then you can go to the next three plans and the next three plans. So the information is given in those sorts of segment. My understanding is cost, since cost is one of the principal concerns in people's minds, cost is one of the parameters upon which the three plans are picked. Here are the top three plans in your area based on cost, covering some portion of these medications, and whether there would be a stand-alone prescription drug plan or one of the PPO- or HMO-type products that would include a prescription drug plan, those are also included in the choices as they are given.

We have some 47 prescription drug plans in Texas that are recognized by Medicare as being good products. You cannot evaluate all 47. So give me the top three based on cost, and let me figure out the coverage and convenience aspect of those. If you have expanded the search to include a HMO or PPO product, let me make the decision based on can I see any doctor I want or would I have to see a select panel of doctors.

Those are the kinds of decisions, the same kinds of decisions people would make in starting a new job, when they went and met with their employee benefits manager. Just like we did when we started in the House 3 years ago, they asked, do you want a HMO, PPO product, and went through the litany of things that might be available to us.

This would be the type of information that would be given to someone. And again, this may be too much for an individual 85 years of age to deal with three plans that are somewhat different in their construct. That is why it is going to be helpful to have a child, a nephew, a grandchild to be able to help make those decisions. Probably the person who helps arrange for those prescription purchases on a regular basis would be the best person to advocate for that particular senior and help them make those choices.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, when you are comparing plans, my understanding is if you look at the most commonly prescribed drugs for seniors, and not every drug may be covered by every plan, there is 97 to 95 percent overlap.

Mr. BURGESS. That is correct, and that information is listed on the Web site.

Mr. MURPHY. And the reason a person wants to compare different plans is to make sure that not only their drug is covered, but different plans may have different costs for those individual drugs. So the person can actually shop around on the Internet or on the phone.

Mr. BURGESS. That is correct. The Internet would provide some transparency that probably is not available to that senior today.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I was in the grocery store the other day, and I wanted to buy a loaf of bread. I had not been in this store before. This store must have had 30 or 40 different types of bread. Every roll, shape, flat, cut, everything. I said I just want some whole wheat bread. They helped me find it.

I thought this sort of reminds me with some of the choices with the Medicare plan. If anything, yes, there are many choices, but it is important to keep in mind that by working with somebody on the Web site or on the phone, and many pharmacies and senior centers offer this. Ultimately the issue is this: that a person should not just compare the cost of a drug, what is this drug going to cost, but what is it going to cost me over a year's period of time.

We looked, for this hypothetical person Jane, what does it cost for a year because in some cases people may say if there is coverage up to \$2,250, and if my drugs cost \$3,000, they may ask, do I have to pay \$3,000? And the answer to that is?

Mr. BURGESS. The answer is, if it is over \$2,250, it would be \$750.

Mr. MURPHY. But the rest is covered. That is part of the confusion that takes place. We need to make sure that our colleagues and America understands this is a matter of looking at the overall cost of medications for your year, and that is why it is important the person writes down all those numbers, and have those annual costs ready, or even your monthly costs, so you can compare.

□ 2215

But it is, I think, the most valuable way that seniors can look at the overall cost of the Medicare plan.

Mr. GINGREY. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania would yield for just a second in regard to that issue. As you go through the Web site, it is important that our colleagues know to let their seniors understand that there is a page there, and Mr. MURPHY was referencing that, where you are able to compare the different plans. Let us say you have several in your community that are available to you, and you narrow it down by the process of whether or not they allow mail order, if they have good discounts for all of the drugs you are on or three out of the four, and then you finally narrow it down maybe

to three or four that you want to choose from.

As you go through this process, and again there is someone right there to guide you through it, you can see really what your cost per year, as Mr. MURPHY was referring to, what each plan would be and then make that intelligent choice, based on a lot of factors, but not the least of which, of course, is that cost factor.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the gentleman for explaining that. It is such a critically important thing here. And this is where, when you look at the cost, a couple of elements that I consider very important, as a health care practitioner myself, that one of the things we recognize is for the most part, when a physician prescribes medication, I am sure the gentleman has seen this too in his practice, prescribe medications, sometimes patients will not fill that prescription. Sometimes, even if they fill it, they may not take it all. They may take it in part and discontinue it, or they may find if they feel they cannot afford it, they stretch it out. Under such circumstances, when a patient does not take a medication that the physician feels is needed, it can actually worsen their health and cost more.

One of the things about this Medicare plan, when the critics were out there saying this is going to cost more, we have to remember the CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, does not score savings. And between the entry physical, between the case management, where there will be pharmacists and others who will work with the physician to make sure they are not getting duplicate drugs, there is not confusion, just checking the dosage and following through, plus the idea that the drugs are more affordable, lifesaving, life enhancing, the kind of things that are so important for people's health are more affordable, that means people will take them. And part of this effect is people will be staying out of the hospitals and staying out of emergency rooms with that as well.

Mr. GINGREY. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. MURPHY hit the nail, I think, right on the head. And as we talk about this, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) is still with us. He may want to weigh in and share some of his thoughts on this subject. But there is no question that this program has the potential to significantly lower prices across the board, maybe not just for our seniors, but to everybody for some of these heretofore very expensive pharmaceutical drugs. And we anticipate that this program, and again, we talked about participation level. Remember, I said at the outset of the hour that Medicare part D, that other optional part of Medicare, probably got a 98 percent participation rate because it is such a good deal.

We will not have that higher participation rate with the part D because many of our seniors already have prescription drug coverage. We mentioned

some of those categories. But this program, we anticipate across the board about a 50 percent savings, maybe 11 or \$1,200 a year on average, and that of course includes people that are low-income. It includes people that are high-income; but on average, we anticipate, is that not right, Mr. CARTER, about a 50 percent reduction.

Mr. CARTER. That is right. And if the gentleman would yield once again. As we talk about this, let us reemphasize again to our seniors the importance of getting registered and signed up for the program. You know, as the gentleman was talking about these drugs, and we read the list off, of those drugs I am familiar with and some of them I am not.

But I thought about how much medicine has changed. And you are the doctors. I am just an old lawyer and trial judge. But I can recall that my father almost died from bleeding ulcers. As a younger man, I was working my way down that road, and, in fact, at one point in time had an ulcer. But Tagamet, I am not plugging any particular brand, but that is the name I know of because that is what I took when Tagamet came on the market; and with that drug, I have never had any more problems whatsoever with ulcers, where my father almost died. They had to give him 7 pints of blood, and he had to be cut from stem to stern like he had been in a knife fight to try to save his life and they had to remove two-thirds of his stomach.

Medicine now can stop a condition that we used to solve with major surgery with prescription drugs. This tool is now available to our Medicare recipients. It is critical that they understand, do not be frightened even by what we have tried to make simple here tonight. Some could even be frightened by that. Do not be frightened by that. Make the effort to save your life. Make the effort to go out there and have every tool that you can be one of those blessings to our country, and that is a senior citizen with long life and good wisdom to pass on to future generations. And you can only be that way if you take care of yourself.

And part of taking care of yourself is getting signed up so that modern medicine can care for you, because with no offense to the great work that our surgeons do, in the long haul, having had a couple of those surgeries myself, I will take that pill all day long and into the night before I want them to cut me wide open because I think modern medicine has been proven over and over, that good preventive medicine, which we now have in this plan, meaning going to get your checkups, get your tests for which you are now covered, do those things that were not available but are now available to you to make sure you are maintaining a look at your health.

And the prescription drug plan along with the other normal medical benefits that have been available before make

this a better future for our senior citizens, a better, healthier, longer future. I cannot impress it upon our people enough. This is so, so life changing in the world. It is not perfect, and we all would love for the world to be perfect. But you know what? When we came in here, somebody hit on it tonight, when we came in here and signed up for Congress and they dropped those half a dozen or a dozen plans in front of me, it might as well have been written in Greek. And I sat there and stumbled and fumbled and said I am sticking with my Texas plan and stayed right where I was. And that is my own fault. And I am confessing it right here in front of God and everybody that that is what I did. But in fact I thought I had a better plan in Texas anyway. But that is a different story. But I understand their frustration because it is a frustrating thing. But that is the world we deal with right now.

Mr. GINGREY. Well, as usual, the gentleman is right on target. And I think it is important that we remember that the plan, typically, if I could describe a typical plan for the typical senior, would be about a \$30 a month premium, would be a \$250 deductible, would be a 25 percent copay, that is, the senior has to pay 25 percent of the cost of the prescription drugs after the 250 out of pocket, up to a total of \$2,250. Then there is this issue of the hole in the doughnut, or the gap, where any cost above \$2,250, up to about \$5,100, is 100 percent on the back of the senior. A lot of people have been concerned about that. They tend to forget, though, that above that you have this catastrophic coverage. If you have spent in any one year on Medicare part D prescription drugs, if you have spent more than \$3,600 out of your pocket, then anything above that is covered at the 95 percent level.

And, really, there are situations like that. Maybe for some seniors today before they sign up for this program, they already know that they are spending \$3,600 or more, maybe \$6,000 a year on prescription drugs. Now, they very well may want to choose a plan. This slide that I have in front of me now sort of goes over that, talks about the premium and the deductible and the gap in the coverage. Well, seniors can choose. They can literally, if they want, particularly, and I would recommend this, if they are on a number of drugs already and they have high costs already and they know that, then they may want to pick a plan that the monthly premium is a little bit higher than the average of 25 or \$30, maybe it is \$50 a month. But it does not have any gap in the coverage. Those plans are available, and that information of course is what they will obtain from the Web site.

I know we are getting close to the exhaustion of our time, and I wanted to call again on my colleague from Pennsylvania to see if he had any closing remarks before we wrap up this hour. And I want to, before I run out of time,

express my appreciation to Mr. CARTER, to Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. BURGESS for joining us during this hour.

Mr. MURPHY. Actually, I think we are out of time, so I yield back the floor here and thank the gentleman for leading this.

Mr. GINGREY. I thank my colleagues. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I yield back whatever remaining time we have and look forward to the next session.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLES of South Carolina). The Chair would remind all members to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to the television audience.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for half of the remaining time until midnight.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We appreciate the opportunity to be here again representing the 30-Something Working Group. I want to thank Leader PELOSI for the opportunity, our favorite uncle, BILL DELAHUNT, who is here from Massachusetts, also KENDRICK MEEK from Florida, DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ from Florida, who are also members of the working group and will be here in just a few minutes.

We want to welcome, Mr. Speaker, everyone to the first-ever 30-Something Live, in which we will be interacting not only with other Members of Congress here, not only with the audience, C-SPAN audience, but also with our friends in the blogosphere. And we will be interacting with them, reading e-mails that they will be sending to us, as we have been receiving e-mails from our constituents in our offices for years on Capitol Hill.

But this is the first time ever that there will be interaction between Members of Congress on the House floor and at the same time constituents and citizens of the United States of America having direct access to this Chamber. So we are very, very excited about introducing 30-Something Live. Being the 30-Something Group, we are trying to take our communications to the next level, trying to reach out to the American people, because we have said for quite some time that if we are going to solve problems in this country, that we have to engage the best and brightest talent that is out in the country in order to do this.

So we are not only going to answer your questions, Mr. Speaker. We are going to take suggestions as to issues that need to be addressed, ideas that folks may have at home. And this is a pretty exciting time for all of us.

We have been joined here with our friend from Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN

SCHULTZ. And this is going to be the first ever. So this is pretty exciting stuff.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. This is really amazing, and I guess, you know, it would not be a surprise. It was an excellent suggestion on your part, Mr. RYAN; and we, I think, are trying to make our generational working group here innovative. I mean, I think we all, as individual Members of Congress basically make our highest priority the ability and desire for us to interact directly with our constituents. And the one place that we are generally not able to do that is on the floor when we are here debating the very issues that impact everyone in this country.

We can interact fairly well with constituents in committee because they can obviously testify in front of us in committee meetings. We obviously interact with constituents in our offices. But once we are here, this is a very insular environment. This opportunity tonight for us to kick this off, 30-something Live, and interact with people who will be submitting questions to us online will be historic and exciting.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Now, you and I, we are ready to rock and roll on this. And when Mr. MEEK gets here, he is going to be ready to rock and roll. But we may have to break it down for our favorite uncle.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Maybe we need a glossary for Mr. DELAHUNT.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We can break it down.

Mr. DELAHUNT. If I can just interrupt, I heard that in my absence the other night that there were some comments that were made about my lack of, well, made about my absence. Could you explain that to me?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I cannot remember exactly which one of us said something, but it was to the effect that we had to tuck you in bed and make sure that you were getting your proper amount of rest.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Well, I am part of the 30-Something Working Group. I might be a two-fer, though. You know, I mean, I would suggest that in my case you get two for one.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. The only difference in your definition of 30-something is maybe it is 30-something by decade.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Something.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And we are 30-something by year.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Exactly. It is a very loose term.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. It is very loose. Adaptable. But it is good to see that you got your nap in this afternoon.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I did. I am rested up and looking forward to participating tonight.

□ 2230

I do concur with everything you said and, again, I want to acknowledge your commitment, your creativity, and the fact that this is an effort to allow peo-

ple to participate in our conversation, because we want to know what they are interested in, and my understanding is there has been a number of questions posed. Maybe the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) or the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) could tell me what the number is.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I believe over 400 e-mails.

Mr. DELAHUNT. That is going to take some time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Well, we are not going to be able to get through them all, so we will lay down some basic ground rules here. We will not be able to get through them all, obviously, Mr. Speaker. We are going to have to take a few and maybe expound on them, but we are going to continue, Mr. Speaker, to make our arguments. We are going to lay out the case for what we believe needs to happen in the country, what direction we need to go in, and as we receive information from the public, use that to supplement our arguments that we have been making here.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. This is not the last time we are going to do this. We are kicking this effort off. So even if we do not get to all the questions tonight, which with over 400 we obviously will not be able to in the 60 minutes, we will be doing this again.

Mr. DELAHUNT. This is simply an inaugural effort. It will be interesting.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I think it is important for us to recognize that we want to make cohesive, coherent arguments, and we are asking, Mr. Speaker, other Members in this chamber and the citizens around the country to help us with that, make points that we feel that maybe they feel need to be made.

Before we get into today, before we get rocking and rolling here, the big issue now is the pre-war intelligence. The President has dusted off this same old speech that he has given hundreds of times already in a hundred different viewing areas regarding the pre-war intelligence. The President has said that anybody accusing the administration of having "manipulated the intelligence and misled the American people was giving aid and comfort to the enemy." So if you question the pre-war intelligence, you are giving aid to the enemy. So it seems like the President is asking us as Members of the United States Congress not to even question any of the intelligence or any of the drum beat leading up to the war.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, if I can, if the gentleman would yield, what I would like to do is try to emphasize that these questions have been posed by Republicans as well as Democrats regarding intelligence, whether it was manipulated, or whether it was used in a selective fashion.

Now, I am going to begin by quoting the former Secretary of State, Colin Powell, who back in June of 2004 in an interview had this to say about the issue of intelligence: In recent weeks, Powell has apologized for at least 2

lapses regarding information about Iraq and terrorism. In a recent Meet the Press appearance, Powell said that he had relied on faulty intelligence when he told the United Nations in 2003 that Iraq had biological weapons. It turned out that the sourcing was inaccurate and wrong and, in some cases, deliberately misleading.

I want to repeat that this evening, because I believe it is important that the American people pay attention to the former Secretary of State's use of words here: In some cases, deliberately misleading.

Now, he does not go on to explain who did the misleading, whose responsibility it was to review the intelligence, to ensure that the sources were reliable, whether there was manipulation. But what I find interesting, Mr. Speaker, is that we are here on this floor asking these questions years, years after Democrats have asked for full and exhaustive investigations, inquiries, and oversight hearings. We have not had a single oversight hearing. Maybe this is simply the by-product of a situation, when you have a single party controlling both branches of Congress and the White House. But if that is the case, it is damning, because it puts before the responsibilities, the constitutional responsibilities of this Congress party loyalty, and I dare say the American people will not accept that.

If I can further proceed, Mr. Speaker, a statement that the intelligence that was available to him was available to Members of Congress, both Members of the House and Members of the Senate. Well, I find that very interesting. First of all, that is inaccurate and wrong. And to support my premise or the statement I just made, I would refer my colleagues and those overhearing this conversation to read a book called *The Price of Loyalty* written by a journalist of some renown, which is basically a memoir of the experiences of the former Secretary of the Treasury, Paul O'Neill whom, by the way, is a conservative Republican, a captain of industry. He ran Alcoa and was selected by this President to serve as his first Secretary of Treasury.

He relates that in the first National Security Council meeting about a week or 10 days after this President was inaugurated, prior, prior to September 11 of 2001, that he was taken aback at that meeting because he participated in those meetings by virtue of his being Secretary of the Treasury, that the focus of the Bush administration was to shift from resolving the Israeli-Palestinian issue to how this administration would deal with Iraq. He was truly taken aback by that.

About a week later, he is at another meeting where there is a map that is put forward about how the oil fields in Iraq would be divided up; what countries and what companies would be allocated the development of those oil fields.

□ 2240

Go to page 96 of that book. But what was particularly interesting was on page 334. This is Secretary O'Neill, a member of the administration, a good Republican with solid conservative credentials.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. He was in the room.

Mr. DELAHUNT. In the room.

"In the 23 months I was there, I never saw anything that I would characterize as evidence of weapons of mass destruction," O'Neill told Time, referring to Time Magazine. "There were allegations and assertions by people, but I have been around a hell of a long time and I know the difference between evidence and assertions and allusions or conclusions that one could draw from a set of assumptions. To me there is a difference between real evidence and everything else and I never saw anything in the intelligence that I would characterize as real evidence."

"In response, a top administration official tried to dismiss O'Neill as out of the loop on weapons of mass destruction intelligence. 'That information was on a need-to-know basis. He wouldn't have been in a position to see it.'"

Just imagine this. We have the President saying that the intelligence was available to everybody. Yet a top administration official in response to the assertion by Secretary O'Neill that he never saw any evidence had this to say: "Oh, it wouldn't have been available to him."

That to me is just inexplicable. I think we deserve an answer from the President. We deserve an answer from the administration as to what actually happened. And I would like to hear from Secretary O'Neill sometime. I think it is important.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Then one of the questions we have here, Mr. Speaker, from Hayward, California asked, What is our mission in Iraq other than being targets for anyone with a weapon? That is really what we are saying. If you try to ask the administration why are we there, what is going on, when are they coming home, we get called unpatriotic. If we ask these questions that a man like Robert Velloza asks, Mr. Speaker, we get called unpatriotic. These are the questions. We have got a lot of questions that people ask, what are we still doing there? What is the plan for getting out? A lot of these. We have got 400 or 500 of these now. A lot of people are asking us, Mr. Speaker, what are we doing? If we try to say to the President, Mr. President, what are we doing, we are unpatriotic now?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Both of my colleagues are absolutely right. The President has some nerve questioning our patriotism. That is what America is all about. I happen to be in the middle of reading Washington's biography. The Founding Fathers created this country so that there could be an opportunity for a vocal minority to express dissent. The farthest thing

from their mind when they created this country was that opposition would be unpatriotic. Of course it is certainly understandable given the climate that the Republican leadership has created here where they do not allow or expect either members of their own party to disagree with them and certainly have structured the rules so that it is virtually impossible for us to voice disagreement or make a significant impact on the process once the process reaches here. Mr. Speaker, the people that have communicated with us have caused me to ask this question. Not only has the President called into question the patriotism of those of us who have questioned why we are still there and when are we going to have a plan to withdraw, but he has also implied that Democrats who have objected to the way we got into this war and the misrepresentation or misallocation of the facts that led us into this war, he has also suggested that those same Democrats saw the same intelligence that the President did. No, they did not. That is factually inaccurate.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Neither did Paul O'Neill, the former Secretary of Treasury who served on the National Security Council.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. The bottom line is that every morning the President gets an intelligence document that we are not privy to. He gets massive amounts of intelligence that they do not widely distribute, even though we have security clearance, widely distribute to Members of Congress. So they were able to be, one would think, Mr. Speaker, selective in what they released to the Members of Congress when we were in the throes of making the decision about whether or not to support, and I was not here at that time, but when those of you that were here were in the throes of deciding whether to support the war.

I just want to read this question that brought this all to mind. You have Mr. Lehman from Goshen, Indiana, who said to us, Since the Iraq war and tax breaks for the wealthy have devastated our Federal budget, why can't the Democrats invoke procedures to semi-close down Congress as this is an emergency situation which is affecting our national economy when the money could be better spent on domestic social programs including hurricane relief. Cut and strut.

That is a really good point. If the American people are asking what are we doing in Iraq when we have so many needs here, when we have literally hundreds of thousands of people in our gulf coast twisting in the wind literally because we cannot get them the assistance they need, yet we are sending millions of dollars, billions of dollars as the gentleman from Ohio has detailed in the charts we have here in the last few weeks that we have been talking about this, the administration has literally chosen sending assistance, infrastructure rebuilding assistance, to the Iraqi people and we are not able to provide that for our own people. All the

while, today, they may still be in the committee meeting now, our own Ways and Means Committee is marking up the tax reconciliation bill, \$70 billion in tax reconciliation to supposedly balance out the budget deficit, the budget deficit reduction act which is a total misnomer that they could not pass last week. The reason that they could not pass it and the reason that it makes no sense is because if you are passing \$70 billion in tax cuts and \$50 billion in spending cuts, that still leaves \$20 billion. That is the kind of thing that the people who are communicating with us are asking, just like Mr. Lehman from Indiana.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. That is absolutely right. Let's get this straight out. I want to kind of lay some things out here because all the rhetoric that we are now hearing and the administration is really good at getting in the huddle and then breaking the huddle and everyone goes onto the TV shows on Sunday and everyone starts singing from the same hymn book and trying to convince the American people that the world is really not what everyone thinks it is. They find a way to try to spin it. I just want to go back just for a couple of minutes for all of us to recognize who we are dealing with here and what their track record is.

The CIA leak where Scooter Libby, the chief of staff of the Vice President of the United States, was indicted on five counts for lying basically, obstruction of justice, false statements, everything else. This is right from the indictment. On July 10 or 11, Libby spoke to Karl Rove who advised Libby of a conversation that he had. Rove talked to Novak, Bob Novak, the columnist, and Novak said that he was going to basically use Joe Wilson, the ambassador who went to Africa to find out what was really going on with uranium and everything else. So Rove tells Libby that Novak is going to write about Joe Wilson's wife. That was in July. Okay?

Then we find out, here it is, 2 months later, in September, Karl Rove denies even knowing anything about a CIA leak or outing Valerie Plame. So he told Libby that Joe Wilson's wife was going to be outed in July and then in September ABC News asks him what is up with this and he says, "I don't know." He lied to the American people. Scooter Libby lied to the American people. The Vice President of the United States in the same indictment told Scooter Libby about Joe Wilson's wife and then 2 months later he did not give all the facts on Meet the Press.

□ 2250

We have to be very careful with the Rules of the House when we deal with high-ranking administrative officials. Okay. So this is the outfit we are dealing with here. This is the group that has failed to be honest.

Now we go through the war. Remember what we heard prior to the war? We are going to use the oil for reconstruc-

tion. We are going to be greeted as liberators. They had weapons of mass destruction. All not true.

We even got a little piece of information, it will be interesting to see how this comes out with the use of phosphorus in Falujah. We were told months ago there was no phosphorus being used. Phosphorus they use in the military. We are not using any of that stuff. If we are using it, we are just using it to light the sky.

Then we find out on November 10, this is quoting from the BBC. This is not the Meek report, the Wasserman Schultz report, the Delahunt report. This is the BBC. "We have learned that some of the information we were provided is incorrect. White phosphorus shells which produce smoke were used in Falujah, not for illumination but for screening purposes." That was in the March and April, 2005, issue of Field Artillery Magazine; and it was used as a potent psychological weapon against the insurgents in trench lines and spider holes.

Now this is the use of a chemical weapon. Now I do not know if it is true or not, but what I do know is that they said they were not using it, and now they are saying they used it.

Mr. DELAHUNT. We do not know. But you know what is sad is that this Republican majority in Congress will not allow us an oversight hearing to determine whether this report is true or not. There has not been a single hearing in the House of Representatives in terms of the Iraq war and all of the issues that we have raised here, not a single hearing; and I would submit that that is just a total abdication of our responsibility.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. In that vein, we actually have an e-mail from one of the folks out there in blogger land who wants us to talk about and ask the question, Mr. Speaker, are the rules that have been enacted for the operation of our U.S. House of Representatives constitutional? And if not, what is the remedy for that? There is a person from Vermont. Can a lawsuit be brought about legal or unconstitutional House rules?

In other words, all Americans must have representation in their government, Mr. Speaker; and if Democrats are ignored because of House rules, not allowed hearings like the ones you are talking about, not allowed to offer an amendment on the House floor to legislation when we are duly elected in the same way, putting our pant legs on one at a time just like they do, or a skirt, like I do on occasion, because of House rules that give full power to a majority political party, half the country does not have representation in the day-to-day business of our own government.

That is the bottom line. We are shut down. And this is not about whining. This is not about, gee, we cannot get in our say. This is about that we were duly elected just like every one of the other 434 Members of this body, and it is not like that in the U.S. Senate. In

the U.S. Senate, the minority is treated with respect. It does not always go their way, but they can at least make an impact. It is truly enough.

What is more unfortunate is how the Republican leadership in this Chamber misrepresents how the process works here, as if we are allowed to call hearings whenever we want to or have subpoena power in the Katrina committee that was created a few weeks ago. They really, consistently, at least since I have been here from the beginning of this year, if you recall during the Schiavo case, facts were not relevant. They just made it up if it suited their argument.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And they will not have a hearing. They are afraid of transparency and accountability.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And they protect themselves with the rules. They hide behind the rules.

Mr. DELAHUNT. They are eroding the confidence of the American people in this institution; and I would hope that they would reflect, stop, and change course. Because if it continues, it is demeaning to this institution, and it is eroding our democracy.

If I can, just for one moment, let me hold up this chart. The gentlewoman earlier talked about the monies that have been expended by American taxpayers in Iraq. There are an abundance of reports from a variety of sources about Iraq reconstruction. The biggest corruption scandal in history.

I serve as the senior Democrat, the so-called ranking member on a subcommittee of International Relations that ought to be looking into these assertions and allegations. I do not know if they are true.

We have had colleagues that have corresponded seeking to have hearings. This is just some of the quotes.

"It is possibly one of the largest thefts in history." This is the Iraqi finance minister speaking about more than \$1 billion missing from the Iraqi Defense Ministry.

"This country is filled with projects that were never completed or were completed and have never been used." This is a U.S. civil affairs officer who asked not to be identified.

"We were told to stimulate the economy any way we can, and a lot of money was wasted in the process." That is Captain Kelly Mims, part of the Army liaison team in Falujah.

"We were squandering the money we were entrusted to handle. We were a blind mouse with money." That is Bill Keller, former deputy advisor to the Iraqi Communications Ministry, referring to reconstruction projects.

"I presume that some of them are ghost employees, but we paid them." That is Frank Willis, former Coalition Provisional Authority, regarding the payments of salaries to 2,400 people who did not exist.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Would the gentleman read that one again about the ghost employees?

Mr. DELAHUNT. "I presume that some of them are ghost employees, but we paid them."

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We are paying ghost employees in Iraq, and we are not allowed to question the validity of what is going on over there?

How about ghosts paying some of my Adelphi workers who are going to get their salaries cut by 60 percent? Does this administration want to ghost pay some of them?

Do we have enough money to pay people for not doing work in Iraq?

Mr. DELAHUNT. We have wasted billions of dollars of taxpayers' money in Iraq, and yet not a single hearing. And I do not want a hearing where some administration official comes up and presents a 5-minute overview and we have 5 minutes to question. I am talking about a thorough, exhaustive investigation done by staff on both sides of the aisle and by serious Republicans and Democrats who find this kind of waste and scandal abhorrent.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We are joined by our good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK), who was getting an award tonight. I congratulate the gentleman. Welcome to the inaugural 30-something Live.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I thank the gentleman very much. It is always an honor to be here on the floor, not only addressing the Members of the House but also sharing with the American people what is not happening.

I came here and I actually picked up an e-mail here. Has there ever been a President who has presided in a bigger increase of the country's national debt and has not vetoed a single spending bill during his term in office?

I can tell you that from what I know, just from my knowledge of what I have been reading recently, I can't remember a President outside of the President that we have right now. And I am pretty sure as we start talking about national debt, we can also talk about the fact that this administration, along with this majority, has led us in just 4 years, \$1.05 trillion in money we borrowed from foreign nations.

Now that is not my number. That came from the Department of the U.S. Treasury.

□ 2300

That is more than 42 Presidents combined. Mr. Speaker, 42 Presidents only were able to get to the point of \$1.01 trillion, and that is over a period of 224 years.

A lot of folks say, well, why are you alarmed? Well, you should be very alarmed, and if the Republican majority allows that kind of borrowing to take place, especially from foreign countries, I guarantee you that the President could not do it on his own.

I guess one of the things that is quite disturbing, I could not help but on Veterans Day turn on the television and watch our President of the United States attack other Americans for being American. I could not help but think that it must have been some sort of coordinated plan in operation, look over there from over here, from what is actually happening.

I can tell you, when you are dealing with the issue of outing CIA agents and indictments and then you say, well, I am going to start attacking Members of Congress that question my policy, maybe we can make that the discussion for the week, I think the American people and also the Members of this House are far more intelligent than that, to think that just because this is your message for this week, it does not necessarily mean that the American people are going to follow you in that message.

You see the majority following suit because it seems to be a message machine. The President spoke of sending the troops mixed signals. Well, I could not help but reflect on that, being a Member of Congress and seeing what is happening right now.

We have a budget amendment that is supposed to come to the floor pretty soon. I guess they did not have the stomach to pass a budget amendment that would have cut VA benefits to veterans, that would have instructed the Veterans Affairs Committee to cut over \$767 million in services to veterans and march in the Veterans Day parade. I guess that was just a little too much for some of the many Members on the majority side, and I want to thank some of those Members who said they were not going to vote for it. I hope they still stand by their convictions this week because that budget resolution has not changed a bit. What they felt last week, they should feel this week.

Also, I should say the President is saying we are sending mixed signals. Well, I guess it is mixed signals when we have over 50 million Americans without health care. What kind of signals are we sending them?

I guess it is mixed signals when we have our men and women who are fighting in harm's way right now, but better yet, when they become veterans, we do not have the same passion for their health care and for their needs.

I guess it is mixed signals when you have to look at our generation and parents that are trying to pay for their child's education and you cut \$40 billion and change out of student loans and student aid. That is mixed signals.

I hope that the President can get just as passionate when it comes down to cutting free and reduced lunches in this country, get passionate about that.

We talk about winning the hearts and minds of the Iraqi people and people abroad. How about winning the hearts and minds of Americans that pay taxes every day?

One other point I just want to make, another mixed signal, as we speak now the Budget Committee is meeting. I guarantee that they are ready and meeting, and on the majority side, the Republican side, to protect people who make over \$500,000 to be able to receive their \$80,000 tax cut. That is sending mixed signals to the American taxpayer. So, if anyone that raised their

hand and said they uphold the Constitution of the United States, you need to be passionate about those Americans that know what it means to punch in and punch out every day.

Last week, one of the Members on the majority side came to the floor and said, well, we are giving tax cuts to the productive Americans. I am assuming that I guess if anyone makes under \$500,000 they are not productive in America.

The bottom line is, is that I am not disappointed in what the President said. I am just a little taken aback because my constituents work every day. Your constituents work every day. There are Americans out there trying to make ends meet.

Better yet, we want to scream at Members of Congress talking about rewriting history. Let us talk about putting this country in a debt that it will be very difficult for us to get out of. Let us talk about record-breaking in 4 years of an administration and this majority allowed this President to do \$1.05 trillion in borrowing from foreign countries, like China I must add, more than Democrat, Republican and Whig party Presidents was not able to achieve. I have to go all the way back to the Whig party, 1776.

Folks say, oh, well, hard times. Well, World War II happened on this side of the chart. World War I happened on this side of the chart. The Great Depression happened on this side of the chart.

Challenges are not new to leadership in Washington, D.C. If people want to borrow and spend, then that is okay if they do it with their money, but when they do it with the American people's money, it is another thing.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, one of the words that our President used was irresponsible; it is irresponsible to question what is going on. Is that responsible, that kind of fiscal undiscipline, reckless disregard for a budget in the United States? That is irresponsible?

And what else is irresponsible? Cutting money for student loans, that is irresponsible.

How about Karl Rove telling Scooter Libby about Joe Wilson's wife and then going on TV a couple of months later and saying he did not know anything about it. I think that is kind of irresponsible to say that to the American public. I did not hear the President say Scooter Libby was irresponsible.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I know the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) is standing by there, but I want to just share this with you.

I have one message for the majority and for the President: Get passionate about the right issues. We are all passionate about the war. We are all concerned about our men and women in uniform, but I tell you one thing. We have American cities that are trying to make ends meet. We have children that are trying to do the best they can under the circumstances. The Leave No

Child Left Behind Act is known by the States, and States are suing the Federal Government for a lack of funding. Meanwhile, as we speak here on this floor, the Ways and Means Committee is meeting to make sure that the tax cuts are permanent for millionaires.

So I am glad that some members of the Senate last week said I cannot vote, at the same time that I am cutting Medicaid for poor Americans free and reduced lunch for children, veterans benefits and then within the same time period, within a couple of days I am going to vote to give millionaires a permanent tax cut?

What I am saying is that there are things that we should get passionate about, and there are some things that we really need to be passionate about. I can tell you right now, there are a number of issues not being addressed, and like you said, the outing of a CIA agent is just like someone running over and telling the enemy about the Marines are going to be on this beach at this time and this day; I just wanted you to know that because I know it. That is what it is like.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. That is irresponsible.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. And it is setting us back. My message for the majority and also for the President is get passionate about the right issues. You want to get passionate about some of the actions in the White House, it is happening right there under your nose. Passion stops at we will just give an ethics course on not sharing national secrets with the press. You have to go far beyond that. Too many people have died. Too many veterans right now need assistance to just go use the restroom right now to give that speech.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, if I can for a moment, I want to take issue with the President's statement relative to support the troops and that asking questions somehow undermines that support. That is false. That is inaccurate.

There is not a Member in this House on either side of the aisle, I cannot believe there is an American anywhere in this country, that does not fervently pray that these young men and women come home, come home without wounds, but I will talk about support for the troops because I believe that if there is a grade to be given for supporting the troops by this White House, it is a failure. It is a failure.

How many letters have we, and again, not just Democrats, but Republicans, sent to this White House complaining about the lack of vests, complaining about the unarmored humvees that so many of our young troops have been killed, permanently maimed, and yet we still have problems? It is an issue that has been lingering for years, not just for months.

I am not suggesting that that was intended, but it is a demonstration of the incompetence of this administration, and underscores, if we are talking about supporting the troops, the lack of that support.

You referenced earlier about veterans. It is easy for the President to wish the troops well as they march into war, and yet it was this White House, this administration, that submitted a budget for the Veterans Administration that was \$2.5 billion less than hopefully the budget that this Congress will pass.

Let me suggest to the White House that that demonstrates callousness and turning your back on those young men and women in Iraq, and it is absolutely a stain on our national honor.

INTELLIGENCE ISSUES AND THE WAR IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLES of South Carolina). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for the remaining time until midnight.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate being recognized and the opportunity to address the House tonight and until tomorrow begins I understand.

First, I would speak to this issue that we have heard as the conclusion of my friends and colleagues from the other side of the aisle, however optimistic they may not be in their presentation to the American people on a regular basis.

As I go through some of the things that are in front of me and I listened to the allegations that have been made that somehow the President has manipulated the intelligence and led this Nation into war because there never were any weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, I will point out that I flat out reject that statement. It is not possible to prove a negative in the first place, and a rational person would understand that from the beginning.

Additionally, we know that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction. We know that he used them 1 time.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that we know that he did have weapons of mass destruction because we provided, during the 1980s, the means for the development of those weapons to Saddam Hussein.

Members of this administration, former Secretary of State Colin Powell, the Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld, they clearly knew because they were involved in assuring that the means to develop weapons of mass destruction were provided to the Saddam Hussein regime.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would point out that I will not concede the accuracy of that, and I do not because I do not have that evidence and I have not seen that. I acknowledge the gentleman's statement for the honorable individual he is, and I would point out that we can

concur then that Saddam had weapons of mass destruction.

In fact, President Clinton made that statement in 1998 very clearly and unequivocally, and my point is that either Saddam Hussein used his last canister of mustard gas on the Kurds and simply ran out of inventory or else those weapons of mass destruction still have to be someplace, and he constructed then an elaborate ruse to dupe the world and dupe seven or eight or nine different countries on the intelligence.

I point out President Clinton's statement: Other countries possess weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles. This is December 1998. With Saddam there is one big difference; he has used them. The international community has little doubt then, and I have no doubt today, says President Clinton, that left unchecked Saddam Hussein will use these terrible weapons.

Again, 1998, Mr. Speaker, and allegations here on this floor and around this country are that somehow President Bush has manipulated intelligence and apparently misrepresented this to the American people, and the implication is also that he has duped these people that have made these statements, including former President Bill Clinton and a number of other high-profile people within his administration.

The allegation would then have to hold true that somehow the governor of Texas, now President Bush, found a way to dupe the national leaders to somehow manipulate and maneuver hundreds of billions of dollars worth of national intelligence to produce these kinds of results.

□ 2315

It is simply a ludicrous position to take. It will not hold water, it is not logical, it is not rational, and the more the American people hear about this, the more they begin to think about it, the more they begin to understand it, the less they are going to believe these allegations.

I would also point out that the individual who has had his 15 minutes of fame and then some, the erstwhile ambassador who was sent by the CIA to go to Niger to investigate the question as to whether Saddam Hussein was seeking yellowcake uranium from Niger, that individual, of course, we know as the husband of now publicly discussed Valerie Plame, at her recommendation. As we understand, he was sent by the CIA.

He had not been in Niger in 20 years. He was not a weapons expert like his wife may have been. But he went there, and he came back and gave one story to the New Republic Magazine. He gave another story under oath to the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence which thoroughly eviscerated his viability and his credibility.

So the statements that were made for publication for the fame did not hold up under oath, did not hold up under scrutiny. One thing we are confident of is that erstwhile ambassador

who went on a mission to supposedly represent the United States, Joseph C. Wilson, the individual who went over there for the CIA, if one is on a mission in a foreign country for the CIA, one would think that they would have some level of integrity they would have to hold up, have some level of confidentiality that they would have to hold up. One would think that if they went on a mission, a secret clandestine mission, first, that they would be qualified; second, that they would maintain that level of secrecy and confidentiality, that they would come back and report back to their superiors and it would be an accurate report and it would be precise and it would be credible and it would hold up under oath.

That report, alleged to have been delivered in print by one Joseph C. Wilson, erstwhile ambassador, was not delivered in print. It was delivered verbally, and the verbal report that we have the notes of and the knowledge of, Mr. Speaker, is a verbal report that indicates that the Iraqis were seeking weapons of mass destruction, yellowcake uranium in Niger. It indicates the very thing that he alleges today was not true.

Yet this seems to be some kind of allegations by the other side, if they like what they hear, are enough for them to say this is confirmed and absolute proof; and rational, thinking Americans know better. Critical thinking Americans know better. In fact, this President would not use any language in a State of the Union address or any other kind of speech unless he knew that it had been thoroughly vetted, it was reliable. And it was, by the way, vetted and reliable and delivered into that speech on January 28, 2003, in these Chambers from just in front of where the Speaker is right now when the President gave his State of the Union Address.

Those now infamous 16 words that are alleged to have been untruthful to the American people start out with "we have learned from the British" that the Iraqis have been seeking uranium from Africa. Now, "we have learned from the British" is true. That is a fact, and no one has challenged that fact. "We have learned from the British that the Iraqis are seeking," that qualification precludes any of the rest of that statement as long as the rest of that statement is consistent with what we have learned from the British; and to turn that into something that is now called a lie is disingenuous and dishonest to the American people.

I reminded the body here last week, last Wednesday night, that there were commercials that were run across this country on television in the 1996 Presidential campaign. There were issues there about integrity and honesty in that Presidential campaign. Charlton Heston went on television, and he said, looking into the camera, "Mr. President, when you say something that is wrong and you do not know that it is

wrong, that is a mistake. But, Mr. President, when you say something that is right and you know it is wrong, that is a lie." That is the distinction between a mistake and a lie. That distinction has not been recognized by the other side of the aisle, and it is willfully being ignored.

I will not concede that a mistake was made. I think the words in that State of the Union Address are precisely accurate. I think the British would concede that point today. I think any rational, critical thinking person would concede that point today, Mr. Speaker. But this has been twisted and warped to the point where it is jeopardizing our national security, and that is why I am on the floor here tonight.

I have been over in the Middle East a number of times. The last time I came back was August 20 of this past summer. I have been there with our men and women in uniform when they are strapped on with helmets and bullet-proof vests. I have been in and ridden in and inspected some of those armored vehicles that have been hit by enemy fire, hit by IEDs. I happen to have inspected an armored Humvee that was hit by a rocket and an RPG almost simultaneously. It rolled off the road upside down, and the four American soldiers that were in that armored Humvee walked away and were on patrol the next day thanks to the armor that is there.

I have been to Fallujah, I believe a year ago last May, where the Marines were bolting on armor then and preparing for battle that was ahead. So we have accelerated the production of our armor for all of our vehicles there. Some of them are not armored. They stay on the base where they are safe. But almost all of our vehicles that go out anywhere where they are in danger are fully armored, top, bottom, and sideways, with bullet-proof windows in them. We have done a fantastic job to ramp up the construction and development of armor and done a pretty good job.

We were not ready for this. The Humvees were not designed to go into combat. They were not designed to drive over IEDs. They were not designed to take direct hits from RPGs or rocket fire. In fact, they were not designed to take hits from AK-47s. They were not a combat vehicle in the beginning of those operations. So we had to adapt to the circumstances that were there.

We began sending steel over there, and it was cut and fitted and it was bolted on or welded on, and our military went right to work as quickly as they could to get as much armor up as fast as they could. We started our factories up here. We took an existing production line and multiplied its production capability by at least 10 times to get our armored Humvees out in place and to put the armor on our trucks and to get ready.

Now we do send out convoys that are fully armored on a regular basis, and it

has been a long time since we have exposed significant numbers of vehicles or American soldiers out there in vehicles that were not armored, Mr. Speaker. So this argument that it is something other than that I think is specious, and I do not think it is based on fact.

The statement that the President made about the irresponsible statements when people undermine our military efforts, I will go further than that, and I will relate an incident for me a year ago last June, about June 17. I was in a hotel in Kuwait waiting to go into Iraq the next day early. I turned on the television to Al-Jazeera TV. As I watched that television, it was Arabic audio and it was English subtitles, and on that television came Moqtada al-Sadr, a big black beard, and as he spoke in Arabic, the English subtitles came on underneath on the screen, and the subtitles said, "If we keep attacking Americans, they will leave Iraq the same way they left Vietnam, the same way they left Lebanon, the same way they left Mogadishu."

Listen to that echo in the ears of Moqtada al-Sadr, and we know that his voice was echoing in the ears of our enemy, the people we call the insurgents on our nice days, the people who are sitting somewhere in a mud hut or a stone building and they have some 155mm rounds. They have got explosives. They have got detonating devices. They have got shrapnel built into this, and they are making improvised explosive devices. They are watching their new satellite dish TV.

Some of the communities there in Iraq have more than one satellite dish per household. They were illegal when we first came into Iraq, but every Iraqi today has access to satellite TV. Every Iraqi today can watch Al-Jazeera TV. And on Al-Jazeera TV, they would see these kinds of scenes of Moqtada al-Sadr saying, "If we keep attacking Americans, they will leave Iraq the same way they left Vietnam, the same way they left Lebanon, the same way they left Mogadishu." And the enemy who are making improvised explosive devices see that on television. It encourages them. It causes them to build more bombs, not less. It causes them to plant more bombs, not less. It causes them to detonate more bombs, not less. It causes them to have more courage, more hope, a stronger spirit to fight our American soldiers because of the words that came out of Moqtada al-Sadr.

Now, imagine how encouraging that is to our enemy over in Iraq, and many of them are not Iraqis. In fact, most of the enemy, I understand, are not Iraqis but imported fighters from other countries. Imagine how encouraging it is when they see on their Al-Jazeera TV, when they hear the voice and see the face of a quasi-leader of the United States of America, someone from the floor of Congress, someone from the floor of the United States Senate, someone who is doing a press conference out on the steps of the Capitol,

someone who is doing talking head television, someone who says, wrong war, wrong place, wrong time, get them out of there, Mr. President, we need to get out of Iraq. Imagine how much encouragement that gives to the enemy. And what is the enemy going to do? They are going to recruit more. They are going to build more bombs. They are going to attack more Americans.

I reject the idea that one can say they fervently pray that the troops come home and they support the troops. I reject the idea that they can support the troops and reject their mission. Mr. Speaker, if you are for the troops, you are for their mission. And if you are against the troops, you are against their mission. But these things are inextricably linked. They cannot be separated.

We cannot ask an American soldier to go in this country or overseas, risk their life, perhaps give their life on a mission that we do not believe in. We would not send them on a mission we do not believe in. We would not ask them to do that. It would be the most dishonest, disingenuous thing we could do as the United States Government in Congress and the President of the United States and Commander-in-Chief to order men and women into a theater of battle and not support their mission.

When I talk with the families that have lost a loved one in this war on terror, it is a sad time, and that price they have paid cannot be felt unless we ourselves have had that loss, but we can empathize with them. We can pray for them. We can sympathize with them. We can try to understand. But invariably those that I talk to, those that I meet with, will tell me they want their son or their daughter's life to have meaning. They want that sacrifice to have meaning. And they will say do not give up on this mission. My son believed in what he did. He volunteered for this mission. Let us have meaning. Let us have freedom for the Iraqi people. Let us have freedom for the Afghani people.

By the way, while I bring that up, what is the distinction between Afghanistan and Iraq? Why do I not hear from the other side of the aisle "get your troops out of Afghanistan"? The statement is never made. We forget about the naysayers that were here before we went into Afghanistan and before we liberated the Afghans. There were plenty of naysayers. They said we cannot go into that part of the world. No one has ever been able to be go into that part of Afghanistan or even Afghanistan at all and be able to liberate, invade, occupy because the terrain is so difficult, that Mujahideen are such tough fighters.

So 2 months after September 11, the American military were in there, coalition forces were in there, and we still heard the naysayers. But as the operation got wrapped up, as there was more security and more safety and votes coming along in Afghanistan where people had never voted before on

that particular piece of real estate, they did so and they have done so twice. They have done that because of the American soldiers giving them that liberty. But the critics essentially shut up about Afghanistan but not about Iraq.

Is the difference the number of lives, Mr. Speaker? Is the difference that 200 Americans have lost their lives in Afghanistan and 2,000 Americans have lost their lives in Iraq? If that is the difference, then I would challenge the left, the pacifist left, the people who have difficulty figuring out how they are going to support the troops and oppose the mission, and if they were rational, they would admit that that dichotomy could not be accepted or tolerated. They cannot seem to draw the line on what the difference is between Afghanistan and Iraq, 200 lives versus 2,000 lives. If the number of lives were the difference, then they should tell us from their position how many are enough. How many lives would they spend to free 25 million Afghans? How many lives would it cost to free 25 million Iraqis?

And, yes, the price has been high, and it has hurt. And it will hurt far more if this job, this task, is not completed, if this freedom that has been so hard fought and won is allowed to go back to a state of tyranny where a dictator would take over in Iraq and where we would see a center for Islamic terrorism for al Qaeda.

□ 2330

It would clearly be there if we pulled out of there today. I would wager if you put this up for a ballot to the Iraqi people and asked, do you want the United States and the coalition forces to pull out as fast as they can, that ballot referendum, I believe 95 percent would say, no, we would like to have the Americans leave not real soon, just soon enough to get control of our country.

That is moving along at an acceptable rate. I will not say I am happy about the speed. It is a tough job. The infrastructure in Iraq has been depreciated and dilapidated over 35 to 40 years of neglect. So there is old equipment that does not function very well. Parts and materials to keep it in shape, many have to be manufactured. The oil fields need new wells and distribution systems. They need to get their refineries up to shape. They need a distribution system that will get that oil out of the country so they can get some cash coming back in.

But Saddam Hussein, when he was in power, was killing an average of 182 of his own people every day. Every day on average. Hundreds of thousands of them have been found in mass graves. The 800,000 Swamp Arabs that were there before Saddam Hussein decided they were an enemy of the state were decimated down to 220,000. Some escaped. In the end, about a fourth of the population of Swamp Arabs in the area of the wetlands, Saddam Hussein dried

them up in order to take away their livelihood and way of life. That area is twice the size of the Everglades, and that way of life was destroyed by Saddam. We have reconstructed about the size of the Everglades, and the Swamp Arabs are starting to repopulate. But that is one-thirtieth of Iraqi population doing what they can.

The argument that Saddam Hussein did not have weapons of mass destruction, and now we hear from the gentleman from Massachusetts that he did, what did he do with them? Where did they go? Matter can neither be created nor destroyed. Saddam Hussein said, I have those weapons of mass destruction. He defied 17 U.N. resolutions stretching back to 1990. We know from September 11 that we cannot wait until a threat is fully developed.

The question still remains, we do not know, we do not know how large the stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction were. We just know he had stockpiles. He used them. We do not know what happened to them. But the King rule of physics is everything has to be someplace. So where are they? There is no evidence he destroyed the weapons of mass destruction. But due to Saddam Hussein's obstruction, the materials once declared by the Saddam regime were never accounted for, even though he declared them.

I also want to point out that in October 2002, a bipartisan majority of Congress authorized President Bush to use force if necessary to deal with the continuing threat posed by Saddam Hussein. We also had a national policy that Congress endorsed of regime change in Iraq.

All of these things were consistent with the will of the people of America, as debated and voted on in Congress. H.J. Res. 114 stated that by continuing to possess and develop a significant chemical and biological weapons capability, and actively seeking a nuclear weapons capability and supporting and harboring terrorist organizations, those were the activities going on by Saddam Hussein.

And the intelligence of countries that concurred with ours. The 15 members of our intelligence community in this country, and additionally some of the other countries who concurred with our intelligence were Great Britain and France. France opposed our operations there, concurred with our intelligence. Germany opposed our operations and concurred with our intelligence. Russia same story: concurred with our intelligence, opposed our operations there.

What do those three countries have in common? The answer is those three countries were three of the most vocal opponents to the liberalization of Iraq. I said at the time that the decibels of their objections to the liberation of Iraq can be directly indexed to their interest in the oil development contracts that they had access to that they designed with Saddam Hussein prior to the beginning of our operations of the liberation of Iraq.

They had a vested interest in the oil in Iraq. They had contracts signed with Saddam Hussein, which of course were nullified by the liberation of Iraq. Come to find out after the fact, it was not just legitimate oil contracts that had them all in a dither; it was also the Oil-For-Food fraud campaign that was replete through those three countries, a number of others besides, and through the United Nations itself. Also, the U.N. Security Council echoed the congressional assessment of the threat posed by Iraq. Even the U.N. Security Council agreed with our intelligence: there was a fair amount of fraud going through the Oil-For-Food program.

I have to point out George Galloway, as a Brit, was apparently profiting significantly from Oil-For-Food, and his wife had a number of six-figure checks deposited in her checking account; and the facts are coming home to roost in the case of Mr. Galloway.

So the objections to the liberation of Iraq, many of the countries that objected had a conflict of interest. That vested interest reminds me of Barbara Conable's famous statement of hell hath no fury as a vested interest masquerading as a moral authority.

That is what we heard prior to the liberation of Iraq. We know Saddam Hussein had sufficient time to shuffle his weapons of mass destruction. They could have buried or spirited them out of the country.

By the way, Iraq is a country where everybody digs holes. It looks like one big prairie dog village. That countryside has a lot of open holes and a lot of things buried. We found a fully operational MiG-29 buried in the desert in Iraq. That is a whole lot bigger than you would need for a stockpile of the weapons of mass destruction. Did we find it because of intelligence or we had a metal detector or because somebody had good instincts, or because we had some scientific way to fly over the top and notice the difference in the terrain? Or did somebody tip us off to find that fully operational MiG-29 buried in Iraq?

Mr. Speaker, no, we found it because the wind blew the sand off the tail fin. If there had been weapons of mass destruction inside that plane, if it just filled the cockpit, that would have been plenty enough to convince even the skeptics on the other side of the aisle that the weapons of mass destruction are not really the question that is before this country or the world, but a red herring that is designed to throw the American people into a frustration with the decision-making process and the effort to convince Americans that things are going badly there.

Whenever we lose an American, that is something going very, very badly. Whenever we have Americans exposed to enemy, we will have casualties, Mr. Speaker. But when we look objectively at what has been accomplished in Iraq, when we objectively look to see that there were milestones set on the cal-

endar, the effort over there has met or exceeded every single milestone.

Certainly the liberation of Iraq came around a lot faster than anybody thought it would. I point out to the American people that the city of Baghdad, about 5 million people, is the largest city in the world, ever in the history of the world, to be invaded and occupied by a foreign power. It happened in the blink of a historical eye with an extraordinarily small number of casualties for a city that size. No one quite believed on that Thursday, an American armored column had gone into Baghdad, driven in and came back out, and the enemy had given up the ghost and essentially disappeared.

But that is what happened. They met that deadline. They set a new milestone for armored columns going across the desert and for the liberation of 5 million people. They were way ahead of the agenda, the targeted timetable.

And then we set up the CPA, the provisional authority under Paul Bremer. The idea was to establish a functional government in Iraq and be able to pass that over to the Iraqis so they could govern themselves. This began in March of 2003. March 22 was the date Baghdad was liberated.

I happen to know, since I was in Mosul sometime after that, that General Patraia and the 101st Airborne that liberated Mosul, they held open and free elections in May of 2003. They elected a governor and vice governor and put together a government of the people by the people and for the people, a Kurd, and I am not sure actually of the religious definition of the other individual, but I watched them interact with each other and I watched them do business. They brought a businessman that could speak English. They were optimistic about the city of Mosul.

In fact, when the 101st Airborne left Mosul and deployed after their year tour of duty, the Iraqis took a boulevard, a broad boulevard in Mosul. And I only saw one street sign in all of Baghdad my first trip. Most everything had been looted and stripped for the metal. The one street sign in Baghdad was a street named Jihad. So they left that up and tore down the other street signs.

Go over to the city of Mosul and I did not notice any street signs there, but I have a picture of a street sign in Mosul, that sign is 101st Airborne Air Assault Division. They named that street after the 101st Airborne. And this was not something put up by the 101st Airborne unless they had the same difficulty with spelling that the Iraqis had. They misspelled "division" and they misspelled "assault." That makes it genuine in that effort.

I am quite proud of the way the Iraqis responded to the Americans. I am proud of the way they respond to them in most of the areas of Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to fly over Fallujah, where we have had as much conflict as anywhere, and see

people come out into the streets and wave and smile. They come out and wave because they are grateful to Americans for giving them a chance at freedom.

But this message that the American people are getting that the credibility of the administration is not there disappoints me a great deal. It undermines our American troops. It does give aid and comfort to the enemy. It encourages the enemy to attack more Americans. It is costing American lives.

When people come to this floor of Congress, when they step out into a press conference, when they speak on the floor of the Senate, they are viewed as quasi-leaders of the United States of America. This encourages our enemies. When I see a soldier anywhere in America, particularly in my district, serve their second tour of duty, and they lost their life defending freedom in their second tour of duty, it is infuriating to me because I believe if we stuck together as a Nation, if we stuck by the deal and the agreement that this Congress has when we have our vote on the floor of this Congress, when the vote goes up and men and women go to war, you stand with them, you stand beside them, you support them with everything you have. That means, yes, bulletproof vests; yes, armored Humvees; and, yes, support and equipment and training and tactics and technology and great leadership.

□ 2345

But it means support the mission, Mr. Speaker. You cannot ask a soldier to go to war and tell him that you do not support their mission. And so the pessimism that abounds that seeks to undermine the presidency here and seeks to establish a majority in the House and the Senate in the upcoming election is all about negativism. It is all about dragging down our foreign policy. It is all about trying to prove to the American people that the administration has not been successful.

But each milestone that is reached in Iraq, handing over the CPA of Paul Bremer's over to the temporary civilian government, that happened 2 days early. And then they had elections, and the elections were there to put people in temporarily into their temporary parliament and the temporary parliament got together and they agreed on a constitution and the constitution was rolled out on time. And they had an election to ratify the constitution, Mr. Speaker, all in an extraordinary amount of time.

The United States of America declared its independence July 4, 1776; and yet we did not get our Constitution ratified until 1789, 13 years later. Now it took a while to earn our freedom, I grant, and the war was long, and it was bloody, and it was costly, and it was brutal. We have our freedom, and we have our Constitution. In fact, the Iraqis have their constitution far sooner than the American Constitution has

been established, and it is ratified by a full vote of the Iraqi people.

Now, about 1 month from today, the Iraqis will go to the polls, and they will select a new parliament, and this will be a sovereign nation when that new parliament is seated. It will have all the legitimacy of any nation that sits at the United Nations today. Iraq will be fully, fully legitimized. The vote of the people will seat the members of parliament. They will select a prime minister and their leaders and that legitimacy that is there takes them to another level.

But this is an astonishing thing. This is far, far more freedom, far, far closer to establishing a functioning rule of law than has ever been seen in that part of the world before. And the inspiration for the Arab people all around Iraq that see that a nation like Iraq can have freedom, when people breathe free, they give inspiration to others who see them breathe free and out of that yearning will bring them to the streets like it did in Lebanon.

The Lebanese reached out for their measure of freedom, and that is part of the inspiration of Iraq, and it is part of the inspiration of Afghanistan. It is part of the inspiration that this President has laid out in an articulated way to the world, the inspiration that we have been attacked by enemies from without. We did nothing to provoke them. They attacked us and killed approximately 3,000 Americans on September 11, 2001. And we went to Afghanistan and liberated 25 million people, and we went to Iraq and liberated 25 million people. Fifty million people that had not been free before in any substantive way are free today. Those two countries can become and I believe will become the lodestar nations, the Arab nations that can be the inspiration for the rest of the Arab world.

The habitat that breeds terror is a habitat that breeds poverty, ignorance, jealousy and hatred. That is the environment that is being exploited by the wahabis and the madrassas that are teaching this hatred in the young people. And the pressure that comes on those countries from the measure of that kind of hatred, they are being taught that, somehow or another, it is part of this age-old philosophy.

I really do believe that if you would scramble up all of our cultures and all of our people and erase our institutional memory and toss us into a totally new environment in a random way, some of us would wake up in the morning and think, huh, my glass is half full, and I am going to go to work and see if I can fill it up the rest of the way. And others, they look at their glass and say mine is half empty and that fellow over there, he is seeking to fill his glass. If he were not doing that, mine would fill spontaneously. That is the class envy, jealousy, hatred that comes.

It has always been this conflict between freedom and communism, freedom and fascism, freedom and national

socialism, and freedom and militant Islamic extremism, all the same kind of class envy jealousy, the hatred that comes from the idea that if somehow other people were not industrious and did not earn a profit, somehow those resources of the world are finite and they will flow at random to other folks who do not quite try so hard or have the technology or have not developed the education. But this spirit of entrepreneurship and free enterprise will establish itself in a strong way in Afghanistan and in Iraq.

In fact, I gave a speech to the Baghdad Chamber of Commerce. I did not know they had a Chamber of Commerce. We pulled into Baghdad at the al Rashid Hotel, and they asked me if I would give a speech to them. So I said yes I would.

It was about 3:00 in the afternoon. Walked in there, and they were getting ready to introduce me, and I said introduce me to the interpreter first. That is going to be really helpful. And they said, no, we do not have an interpreter. You do not need an interpreter, Mr. Congressman, because they all speak English here at the Baghdad Chamber of Commerce. About 56 to 58 of them sitting at the dinner tables.

So I gave them a little speech, and you could tell they understood English. They laughed at the right time, and they smiled at the right time, and they clapped at a time that I thought was appropriate anyway. I was quite encouraged at the level of interest in developing a culture of free enterprise in Iraq.

When that speech was over, I needed to get on to the next meeting, but it was an instantaneous cluster, huddle like, actually. They had to eventually just pull me out of this huddle. We were passing back and forth business cards and writing notes and trying to find a way to connect with the inspiration of free enterprise that is embodied in almost every American that walks the streets of Baghdad or Iraq. They look to us to be leaders in a lot of ways, not just military but on free enterprise capitalism perspective, and as they continue to develop that their economy will grow.

It takes a level of integrity and morality to have a functioning free enterprise system. It works on trust is why. As that trust gets built and established in the culture in Iraq, it is going to be a stronger and stronger economy. As the free enterprise economy flows out in Baghdad and the other cities in Iraq and connects itself with the new thing that will come, that will be available for the Iraqis after December 15, when they are a truly sovereign nation in control of all of their own assets, then they will be able to sit down and negotiate or have competitive bids for the development of the oil resources in Iraq.

They must have that. They must have outside capital, foreign capital and foreign technology and foreign know-how, and a lot of it should be and

hopefully is American technology capital know-how to pour into Iraq, to go out and punch in hundreds of new oil wells and new pipelines and distribution systems and refineries so that that oil can pour out of that country and the money can pour in.

Another allegation that comes from the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, is that somehow we did this all for oil. But oil is something that you can purchase on the open market around the world. We did not go in there to steal anybody's oil. We went in there to protect that oil for the Iraqis.

It is absolutely clear that the oil resources of Iraq belong to the people of Iraq, and we protected that, preserved that, and we are keeping our pledge with the Iraqi people. They will develop the oil resources with foreign capital and, when that happens, then the cash will flow into the economy and it will multiply itself over and over again. And Iraq becomes the lodestar Arab nation that brings freedom to that part of the world.

Like, as the European, the eastern European nations saw, an echo of freedom go across eastern Europe when the wall went down on November 9, 1989, I believe we will see an echo of freedom go through the Arab world, probably not as dramatically, probably not as quickly, probably not as bloodlessly. But I believe we will see a free Arab people some time within the next generation.

At that point, the habitat that breeds terrorists will disappear. It will not be the culture that can create that kind of a thing. And I mean that two ways. But the culture of freedom does not produce a culture of terror. In fact, free people never go to war against other free people. This country has never gone to war against another democracy, another group of people that had an opportunity to go to the polls and select their leaders and their national destiny. That is another known fact that does not seem to get out on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker.

So I am optimistic about the solutions there. I applaud the President's vision and having the courage to step in and take the initiative to free 50 million people, 50 million Arab people, to give them an opportunity. And those people will be our allies, by the way, for a long, long time to come in a part of the world where it is pretty important to have those kind of allies.

As I listened to some of the other lamentations that were here earlier this evening, the discussion about the Budget Reconciliation Act, the people who are critical of that, of the Deficit Reduction Act that we brought some \$53 billion to come out of the proposed spending up until the year 2010, not enough, but a start. A half of 1 percent of our budget is all that amounts to, Mr. Speaker. I do not think it is very hard to step up and do a very small half of 1 percent trim, given the kind of spending that we have had.

But the other side of the aisle does not offer \$1 in fiscally responsible cuts,

not one; and they do not offer one vote to support our fiscal responsibility, not one. Additionally, they demagogue the very things we have done that are responsible.

The statement was made over here earlier tonight that we have cut \$40 billion from the student loans and that somehow it is going to come out of the students, their loans and their aid. Not. Not \$40 billion from the student loans. The students are not going to notice any difference unless there is more cash available, not less, because we have made administrative changes, changes that affect the interest rates and the fees that are being charged by the lenders. This is not going to affect the students. This is reform. That is efficiency in government and efficiency in business.

But you know the demagoguery again. If I was as pessimistic as this and if I had this philosophy, this argument that everything is wrong and you cannot trust your leadership night after night after night, I think I would swim to Cuba and try to find a place where I would be happy. That would be my advice to the people that are here every night tearing down the optimism of America, undermining the truth that is America and making it difficult for us to move forward into this bold and brave future that we need to.

And, by the way, they have no confidence in our economy. I would go down through the whole list of economic indicators. We have had the longest period of consistent growth over 3 percent for 10 consecutive quarters. That is the longest since for the last two decades to have that kind of growth. Unemployment is down to 5.0 percent, when 5.6 is considered to be a pretty good position to be in. It has been ratcheting down. This economy has been creating more and more jobs. Nearly every economic indicator is stronger and stronger and stronger.

That in the face of the negatives, that in the face of Hurricane Katrina. This in 10 consecutive quarters of growth over 3 percent is after we got hit by September 11 and the attack on our financial markets. It is after some of the business circumstances that were brought up short by this Congress, and I am pleased that they were, hit the markets as well. After people lost confidence in the markets, September 11 came and destroyed the financial industry. We still came back and recovered with 10 consecutive quarters of growth over 3 percent, Mr. Speaker.

So this is a strong and robust economy, and it is a credit to the Bush tax cuts, those tax cuts that we need to make permanent, the extra resources, the billions of dollars that we have in our Treasury today because we had the courage to cut taxes so our economy could grow and create jobs. That is the kind of vision that is sorely lacking on the other side. They are good at criticizing, but I am waiting for a positive agenda, Mr. Speaker.

This idea that American soldiers should be, go off and fight without support for their mission has got to come back to the people who believe somehow they can support our soldiers but not support the mission, Mr. Speaker. So I just tell you that I am optimistic about the future of America. I know our economy is strong. I am optimistic about the future of our economy.

I am watching a confirmation process begin over in the United States Senate for Judge Alito. I think he will be the individual that comes to the Supreme Court and begins a constitutional restoration process. I am looking forward to that. We must restore this Constitution. It has been eroded over the last 30 to 40 years with activist judges.

The Kilo decision was the last straw for me and a lot of us. I agreed with the liberals on that. I will say that the gentleman from Massachusetts and I, whom we most generally disagree, he and I agreed and spoke essentially back to back here on the floor in opposing the Kilo decision. That is Mr. FRANK from Massachusetts. When he and I agree on a constitutional issue I am going to say and oppose the Supreme Court, chances are the text of the Constitution ought to be respected.

We will get back to that, Mr. Speaker, with this confirmation of Judge Alito. The corner needs to be turned. The American people need to be informed on how positive things are over in Iraq and that our economy is strong and we are going to move forward in a bold future with a bold agenda.

We need to pass this reconciliation act so that we can offset the costs of Hurricane Katrina. I will do more. We need to drill for oil in ANWR. We need to drill for natural gas and oil on our Outer Continental Shelf and hand this future over to our children and grandchildren with oil supplies, good tax programs, a national security program, a whole package. So, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your indulgence tonight and the privilege to speak to this House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PERMISSION TO HAVE UNTIL 2:00 A.M., NOVEMBER 16, 2005 TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3058, TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until 2:00 a.m., November 16, 2005 to file the conference report to accompany H.R. 3058, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ING-LIS of South Carolina). Is there objec-

tion to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. McNULTY (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and November 16 on account of a funeral in the district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. WYNN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. WATSON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MORAN of Kansas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, today and November 17.
Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FORTENBERRY, for 5 minutes, November 16 and 17.
Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and November 16, 17, and 18.
Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today and November 16.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, November 16 and 17.

Mr. KING of Iowa, for 5 minutes, November 16.

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.
(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. PELOSI, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2419. An act making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE
PRESIDENT

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on November 10, 2005, he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 3057. Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2006.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at midnight), the House adjourned until today, Wednesday, November 16, 2005, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5191. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 2-Bromo-2-Nitro-1, 3-Propanediol (Bromopol); Exemptions from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP-2005-0280; FRL-7743-5] received November 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5192. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Flucarbazone-sodium; Time-Limited Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2005-0254; FRL-7740-8] received November 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5193. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — S-metolachlor; Pesticide Tolerance Technical Correction [OPP-2004-0326; FRL-7741-7] received November 14, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5194. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Sulfosulfuron; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-2005-0270; FRL-7740-1] received November 14, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5195. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Selected Acquisition Reports (SARs) for the quarter ending September 30, 2005, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2432; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5196. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Qatar pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5197. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5198. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of

Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Indiana; Redesignation of Greene County and Jackson County 8-hour Ozone Nonattainment Areas to Attainment for Ozone [R05-OAR-2005-IN-0009; FRL-7995-9] received November 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5199. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans for Air Quality Planning Purposes; California — South Coast and Coachella [CA-314-0483; FRL-7975-7] received November 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5200. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Arizona; Correction of Boundary of Phoenix Metropolitan 1-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area [OAR-2005-0150a; FRL-7995-3] received November 8, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5201. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Interim Final Determination to Stay and/or Defer Sanctions, Final County Air Quality Control District [R09-OAR-2005-AZ-0007; FRL-7994-6] received November 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5202. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the Requirements on Variability in the Composition of Additives Certified Under the Gasoline Deposit Control Program; Final Rule [OAR-2004-0029; FRL-7996-2] (RIN: 2060-AK62) received November 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5203. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Metropolitan Washington D.C. 1-Hour Ozone Attainment Plan, Lifting of Earlier Rules Resulting in Removal of Sanctions and Federal Implementation Clocks [RME NO. R03-OAR-2004-MD-0010; FRL-7997-5] received November 14, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5204. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants, Commonwealth of Virginia; Control of Emissions From Hospital/Medical/Infectious Waste Incinerator Units; Correction [VA139-5073a; FRL-7997-6] received November 14, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5205. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Control of Air Pollution From Aircraft and Aircraft Engines; Emission Standards and Test Procedures [OAR-2002-0030; FRL-7997-3] (RIN: 2060-AK01) received November 14, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5206. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Control of Air Pollution

from New Motor Vehicles; Revisions to Motor Vehicle Diesel Fuel Sulfur Transition Provisions; and Technical Amendments to the Highway Diesel, Nonroad Diesel, and Tier 2 Gasoline Programs [OAR-2005-0153; FRL-7996-9] (RIN: 2060-AJ71) received November 14, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5207. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Determination of Attainment, Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Indiana; Redesignation of Delaware County to Attainment of the 8-Hour Ozone Standard [R05-OAR-2005-IN-0008; FRL-7997-8] received November 14, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5208. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Final Rule to Implement the 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard — Phase 2; Final Rule to Implement Certain Aspects of the 1990 Amendments Relating to New Source Review and Prevention of Significant Deterioration as they Apply in Carbon Monoxide, Particulate Matter and Ozone NAAQS; Final Rule for Reformulated Gasoline [OAR 2003-0079; FRL-7996-8] (RIN: 2060-AJ99) received November 14, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5209. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Brick and Structural Clay Products Manufacturing: Reconsideration [OAR-2002-0054; FRL-7997-9] (RIN: 2060-AM94) received November 14, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5210. A letter from the Chief, Policy and Rules Division, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Part 2 of the Commission's Rules to Allocate Spectrum Below 3 GHz for Mobile and Fixed Services to Support the Introduction of New Advanced Wireless Services, including Third Generation Wireless Systems [ET Docket No. 00-258] received October 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5211. A letter from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Goldendale, Washington) [MB Docket No. 05-8; RM-11142]; (Port Angeles, Washington) [MB Docket No. 05-11; RM-11144]; (Ty Ty, Georgia) [MB Docket No. 05-12; RM-11145] received October 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5212. A letter from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Cameron and Hackberry, Louisiana) [MB Docket NO. 05-138; RM-11162; RM-11266] received October 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5213. A letter from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Glenville, Clyde, and Weaverville, North Carolina and Tazewell,

Tennessee) [MB Docket No. 02-352; RM-10602; RM-10776; RM-10777] received October 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5214. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

5215. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 06-07, concerning the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office for defense articles and services; to the Committee on International Relations.

5216. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's annual report of the activities of the United Nations and of the participation of the United States during the calendar year 2004; to the Committee on International Relations.

5217. A letter from the Chief Human Capital Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5218. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5219. A letter from the Chief Administrative Officer, United States Capitol Police, transmitting the semiannual report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period April 1, 2005 through September 30, 2005 as compiled by the Chief Administrative Officer, pursuant to Public Law 109-55, section 1005; (H. Doc. No. 109-69); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

5220. A letter from the Under Secretary for Emergency Preparedness and Response, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting notification that funding under Title V, subsection 503(b)(3) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, as amended, has exceeded \$5 million for the response to the emergency declared as a result the influx of evacuees from areas struck by Hurricane Katrina beginning on August 29, 2005 in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5221. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's eighth report to Congress and sixth report to the President entitled, "The National Initiative for Increasing Safety Belt Use, Buckle Up America Campaign"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5222. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's summary and detailed breakdown of the disability-related complaints that U.S. and foreign passenger carriers operating to and from the U.S. received during the 2004 calendar year, pursuant to section 707 of the Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5223. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting an informational copy of a Report of Building Project Survey for Lancaster, PA, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5224. A letter from the President, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, transmitting the report due on October 31, 2005 of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 761(c); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5225. A letter from the Chairman, Labor Member, Management Member, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's 2005 report for the fiscal year ended September 30, 2004, pursuant to section 7(b)(6) of the Railroad Retirement Act and section 12(l) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Ways and Means.

5226. A letter from the Admiral, United States Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a copy of a draft bill, "To implement Annex VI to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973, as amended by the Protocol of 1978 relating thereto."; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Armed Services, and the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 326. A bill to amend the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area Act of 2000 to adjust the boundary of the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area and to extend the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance under that Act; with amendments (Rept. 109-294). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Committee on Rules. House Resolution 553. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1065) to establish the United States Boxing Commission to protect the general welfare of boxers and to ensure fairness in the sport of professional boxing (Rept. 109-295). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOEHLERT: Committee on Science. House Resolution 515. Resolution of inquiry requesting the President of the United States to provide to the House of Representatives certain documents in his possession relating to the anticipated effects of climate change on the coastal regions of the United States; adversely (Rept. 109-296). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. ABERCROMBIE):

H.R. 4318. A bill to terminate the effect of all provisions of Federal law that prohibit the expenditure of appropriated funds to conduct natural gas leasing and preleasing activities for any area of the Outer Continental Shelf, to terminate all withdrawals of Federal submerged lands of the Outer Continental Shelf from leasing for exploration for, and development and production of, natural gas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 4319. A bill to provide assistance for small and medium enterprises in sub-Saharan African countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OXLEY (for himself and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 4320. A bill to restore the financial solvency of the national flood insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. TANCREDO (for himself, Mr. HAYWORTH, and Mr. GOODE):

H.R. 4321. A bill to repeal the amendment made by section 796 of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006, exempting from harboring sanctions compensation for alien volunteers for certain religious organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POMBO (for himself and Mr. RAHALL):

H.R. 4322. A bill to provide for Indian trust asset management reform and resolution of historical accounting claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H.R. 4323. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions, to provide certain hurricane-related tax relief, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHUSTER (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. OBERSTAR):

H.R. 4324. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to reauthorize the predisaster mitigation program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WELLER (for himself, Mr. HONDA, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. SWEENEY):

H.R. 4325. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income for certain education and training expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia (for herself and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 4326. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a contract for the nuclear refueling and complex overhaul of the U.S.S. Carl Vinson (CVN-70); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDREWS (for himself and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 4327. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to deny a passport to a noncustodial parent who is the subject of an outstanding State warrant of arrest for nonpayment of child support and to deny a passport to a custodial parent who is likely to remove a child from the United States to prevent contact permitted between the child and the noncustodial parent; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4328. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to restore child's insurance benefits in the case of children who are 18 through 22 years of age and attend postsecondary schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4329. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act to provide that a contractor under that Act who has repeated violations of the Act

shall have its contract with the United States canceled and to require the disclosure under freedom of information provisions of Federal law of certain payroll information under contracts subject to the Davis-Bacon Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida (for himself, Mr. PUTNAM, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. FOLEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BONNER, Mr. SHAW, Ms. HARRIS, and Mr. MEEK of Florida):

H.R. 4330. A bill to provide assistance to agricultural producers whose operations were severely damaged by the hurricanes of 2005; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, Ways and Means, and Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Miss MCMORRIS (for herself, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. OTTER, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon):

H.R. 4331. A bill to provide for a Medicaid demonstration project for chronic disease management; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota (for himself, Mr. COSTA, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. BACA, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BARROW, and Mr. BOSWELL):

H.R. 4332. A bill to provide for an automatic one-year extension of the authorizations of appropriations and direct spending programs of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 and to provide for an additional one-year extension if implementing legislation is not submitted with respect to the Doha Development Round of World Trade Organization negotiations by January 15, 2008, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SANDERS:

H.R. 4333. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish performance standards for fine particulates for certain pulp and paper mills, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself, Mr. FOLEY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. MACK, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. PUTNAM, and Mr. DAVIS of Florida):

H.R. 4334. A bill to provide emergency tax relief for persons affected by Hurricane Wilma; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SPRATT:

H.R. 4335. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Fluorobenzene; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 4336. A bill to designate the visitor center and other related facilities at the U.S.S. Arizona Memorial in Hawaii as the "Pearl Harbor Memorial Site"; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ORTIZ (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. STARK, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. SALAZAR, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BACA, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. REYES, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FARR, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. LEE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. WATSON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. DREIER):

H. Con. Res. 297. Concurrent resolution honoring the life and expressing the deepest condolences of Congress on the passing of Edward Roybal, former United States Congressman; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SHAW:

H. Con. Res. 298. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Lung Cancer Awareness Month and expressing the sense of the Congress that the Federal commitment to lung cancer research and earlier detection must be significantly increased; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mrs. BONO):

H. Con. Res. 299. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the leaders of Congress and other legislative branch offices should work together to establish and implement a coordinated program for the reuse, recycling, and appropriate disposal of obsolete computers and other electronic equipment used by offices of the legislative branch; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. BALDWIN:

H. Res. 552. A resolution recognizing the 50th Anniversary of the Crop Science Society of America; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself and Mr. WYNN):

H. Res. 554. A resolution urging the Government of the Gabonese Republic to hold orderly, peaceful, and free and fair presidential elections in November 2005; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. WALSH (for himself, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SWEENEY, and Mr. PAYNE):

H. Res. 555. A resolution expressing support for the Good Friday Agreement of 1998 as the blueprint for lasting peace in Northern Ireland; to the Committee on International Relations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

197. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New

Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 282 memorializing the Congress of the United States to authorize National Guard members to enroll in Department of Defense managed health care program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

198. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to House Concurrent Resolution 37 urging the Congress of the United States to increase the presence of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in Texas, improve coordination of Centers for Disease Control and Prevention programs with those operated by the Texas Department of State Health Services, and increase the amount of federal resources coming into Texas from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

199. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution 6 urging the Congress of the United States to enact legislation establishing a domestic energy policy that will ensure an adequate supply of natural gas, the appropriate infrastructure, and a concerted national effort to promote greater energy efficiency and that will open promising new areas for environmentally responsible natural gas protection; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

200. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 227 urging the Congress of the United States to support the Passaic River Restoration Initiative; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

201. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 urging the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide for federal deployment of the Strategic National Stockpile within Mexico, provided that the Mexican government approves said requests pursuant to treaties and other agreement with the United States; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and International Relations.

202. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to House Concurrent Resolution 166 urging the Congress of the United States to increase funding to the fully authorized level and include advance funds for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program and to pursue a more equitable funding allocation formula for the program; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Education and the Workforce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 23: Mr. MURTHA and Mr. MICA.
H.R. 111: Mr. MELANCON.
H.R. 114: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 303: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.
H.R. 408: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 500: Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 503: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 562: Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 586: Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 602: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KUHL of New York.
H.R. 633: Mr. PASTOR and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
H.R. 669: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 676: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 713: Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 752: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
H.R. 817: Mr. CASTLE.

H.R. 972: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 986: Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 1070: Mrs. SCHMIDT.
H.R. 1071: Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 1105: Mr. OTTER.
H.R. 1141: Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 1144: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1241: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 1259: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. TANNER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. NADLER, and Ms. HART.
H.R. 1286: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 1288: Mr. NUSSE.
H.R. 1290: Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 1352: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 1356: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 1402: Mr. SWEENEY and Ms. HARRIS.
H.R. 1425: Mr. McNULTY.
H.R. 1595: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1668: Mr. ORTIZ and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1790: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 1951: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. TANCREDI, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1957: Mr. SHADDEGG.
H.R. 2014: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2048: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Mr. FOSSELLA.
H.R. 2076: Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan.
H.R. 2134: Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 2328: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2355: Mr. POMBO and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2471: Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 2594: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 2617: Mr. MEEKS of New York.
H.R. 2652: Mr. ISTOOK.
H.R. 2717: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 2892: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 2989: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 3195: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 3255: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 3312: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.
H.R. 3334: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3361: Mr. HOLT, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. DENT.
H.R. 3401: Mr. KUHL of New York.
H.R. 3427: Mr. KUHL of New York.
H.R. 3476: Mr. WYNN and Mr. CARDIN.
H.R. 3616: Mr. WYNN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. OWENS, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 3626: Mr. MATHESON and Mr. CANNON.
H.R. 3640: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 3641: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 3642: Mr. CLAY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Ms. SOLIS.
H.R. 3680: Mr. BOREN.
H.R. 3704: Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 3709: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 3717: Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 3748: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3795: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 3861: Mr. HONDA, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. ABER-

CROMBIE, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 3883: Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.
H.R. 3889: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. PICKERING, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 3915: Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 3944: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 3949: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
H.R. 3964: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 4005: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. ETHERIDGE.
H.R. 4015: Mr. FLAKE.
H.R. 4025: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mrs. MCCARTHY, and Mr. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 4032: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PENCE, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
H.R. 4039: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 4049: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 4104: Mr. PAUL and Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 4126: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 4145: Mr. BARROW, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BERRY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SPRATT, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4183: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 4184: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 4200: Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. MATHESON.
H.R. 4223: Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. BARROW, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 4239: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. HALL, and Mr. KUHL of New York.
H.R. 4263: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4272: Mr. PAUL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 4293: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 4300: Mr. WALSH.
H.R. 4306: Mr. PENCE.
H.J. Res. 38: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.J. Res. 70: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mrs. CAPPS.
H. Con. Res. 40: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. BAKER.
H. Con. Res. 88: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H. Con. Res. 137: Mr. CONYERS.
H. Con. Res. 173: Mr. LIPINSKI and Ms. LEE.
H. Con. Res. 190: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H. Con. Res. 197: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H. Con. Res. 230: Mr. POMBO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Ms. NORTON.

H. Con. Res. 235: Mrs. MALONEY.
H. Con. Res. 268: Mr. ISSA, Mr. FERGUSON, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. HAYES, and Mr. POMBO.
H. Con. Res. 275: Mr. TERRY, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H. Con. Res. 280: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FALDOMAEGA, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. SOUDER.
H. Con. Res. 284: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.
H. Con. Res. 287: Mr. BARROW, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SABO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. ROTHMAN.
H. Con. Res. 288: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. HONDA.
H. Con. Res. 292: Mr. SANDERS.
H. Con. Res. 294: Mr. TANCREDI, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. FALDOMAEGA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. GINGREY, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H. Res. 97: Mr. RENZI and Mr. MARSHALL.
H. Res. 123: Mr. HAYES.
H. Res. 196: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. OWENS.
H. Res. 297: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.
H. Res. 325: Ms. LEE.
H. Res. 430: Mr. ISTOOK.
H. Res. 438: Mr. MEEKS of New York and Mr. SCHIFF.
H. Res. 458: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H. Res. 487: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. FALDOMAEGA, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. INSLEE.
H. Res. 500: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. CRENSHAW.
H. Res. 517: Mr. HINCHEY.
H. Res. 519: Mr. SPRATT and Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.
H. Res. 526: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H. Res. 529: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. HART, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. BASS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
H. Res. 535: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. PITTS, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H. Res. 546: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. MCHUGH.
H. Res. 547: Mr. WELDON of Florida.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3385: Mr. LEVIN.